

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE are not many things more puzzling in the New Testament than the holy kiss. It is a feature of the early Christian gatherings. It belongs especially to the gatherings for the celebration of the Eucharist. But what was the origin of it? And what did it mean?

There is no parallel in the Old Testament. There is no parallel in Gentile custom or literature. In the narrative of the woman who was a sinner, Jesus said to the Pharisee who invited Him to dinner, 'Thou gavest me no kiss.' That also is puzzling. It gives no assistance in explaining the kiss of love. It needs explanation itself. For there is no record anywhere that it was a custom for the Jewish host courteously to kiss his guests as they came.

The Jews said there were three kinds of kiss. To account for Jacob's kissing Rachel they added a fourth, the kiss of relationship. But they had no custom which could have suggested to the early Christians the 'kiss of love,' as St. Peter calls it, or the 'holy kiss,' as it is called by St. Paul, when they met together for worship.

Dr. Edwin A. ABBOTT looks into the matter. Dr. ABBOTT has issued another great volume on the interpretation of the Gospels. It is called

The Fourfold Gospel. Section IV.: The Law of the New Kingdom (Cambridge: At the University Press; 12s. 6d. net). Not less than any of the numerous great volumes which have preceded it, this volume is a marvel of minute learning, all brought together to make the Gospels more intelligible. In the course of studying the Miracles of Feeding, Dr. ABBOTT is drawn to the occasion upon which Jesus Himself served at tables, the occasion upon which, during the Last Supper, He girded Himself with a towel and washed the disciples' feet. It was an act of love. It was an act, Dr. ABBOTT thinks, of passionate love. And it leads him to consider whether there are other traces in the New Testament of passionate feeling, expressed in passionate words or acts. He is led at once to the holy kiss.

He does not find it in the Gospels. And he does not hint that Jesus Himself either practised or recommended it. He finds it in the Pauline and Petrine epistles. But only in the earliest epistles. For there were risks attaching to it. These risks were recognized by early writers. 'The shameless use of the kiss,' says Clement of Alexandria, 'which ought to be mystic, occasions foul suspicions and evil reports.' And it may be that St. Paul thought it better to give no further encouragement to the practice when he wrote his later epistles.

But what did it signify, and why did it originate? Dr. ABBOTT has two explanations to give. Both are good, and both may be true.

It was a kiss of relationship, like the kiss which Jacob gave to Rachel. For were they not brethren now, these followers of Jesus? He called them so. 'Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.' And they certainly recognized their new relationship. When He told them to love *one another*, they accepted the commandment as new and found a word to express the new relationship. This love of brethren—the love of John to Peter, of Simon Zelotes to Judas not Iscariot—*philadelphia* they called it, brotherly-love. And when the writer of 2 Peter threw out his chain of virtues he used this word to form its last two links, saying, 'and to brotherly-love add love.' They knew that where brotherly-love was there might the kiss of love be. And they saluted one another with a holy kiss.

But the other explanation is better. Dr. Edwin ABBOTT has been a painstaking and most erudite student of the Gospels. But he would never have called himself their passionate admirer. He is arrested by this kiss of love. Is it possible, he asks himself, that there is something in the Gospels which I have missed? Is there a power in Christ? Is there an influence which I have not reckoned with or recognized? 'Many believe easily enough in Christ's material miracles who do not realize His spiritual, social, and (so to speak) revolutionary miracles wrought on human nature.' He finds in the holy kiss the high-water mark of a passion of devotion to the person of Christ and then to those that are His, a high-water mark 'reached at one rush by the religion of Christ during the period that followed His death.' Why did they begin to kiss one another? Their answer was, 'The love of Christ constraineth us.'

They lost that first love. Grievous wolves entered in, not sparing the flock. Men and women kissed one another not out of spiritual love but out of carnal affection. The custom became a scandal, and had to be discontinued. But it will come again. Dr. ABBOTT believes that it will come again, though in a different way. 'Then it was reached by a visible Presence and an audible Voice. Hereafter the Presence may be not visible, and the Voice not audible, to the bodily sense. But in either case the Spirit will be the same, human yet divine, cosmopolitan yet homely, the Spirit of the Family of God breathed into God's children by God's Son.'

In preparing that great edition of the New Testament in Greek which we know by the name of Westcott and Hort, the editors placed the utmost reliance upon the two manuscripts A and B. When these two manuscripts agreed, their text was adopted. Once only did they agree and yet were set aside. It was in their spelling of the last word of James 1¹⁷. As Hort expressed it, that was their 'solitary blunder.' It has just been shown, on excellent authority, that it is no blunder, but the correct text.

According to the Authorized Version this is the verse: 'Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' How does the ordinary reader understand that? He is a little puzzled with the repetition of the word 'gift.' He does not see clearly why the gift should be called first 'good' and then 'perfect.' 'The Father of lights' is an expression with which he is not familiar, and he is not quite sure that he understands it. And the meaning of 'shadow of turning' at the end of the verse he takes to be 'the least trace of changing,' or else it is altogether hidden from him. Still he thinks he understands what St. James in his own way wishes to say. God, who is the giver of all the blessings of life, may be trusted to give them

throughout life, because it is not in His nature to change.

Then comes the little knowledge which is a distressing thing. Turning to the Revised Version the reader finds that there are two kinds of gift, for now he reads, 'Every good gift and every perfect boon.' He finds that 'variableness,' though it seems a better word for the character of God, is not so correct a translation as 'variation.' And he finds that he was all wrong in taking 'shadow of turning' to mean the least trace of changing. For the Revised Version has 'shadow that is cast by turning.'

The ordinary English reader is not alone in thinking that 'shadow of turning' means small amount of turning. That is how the Old Latin understood it (*modicum obumbrationis*); and not only the Old Latin versions, but also several of the early Greek commentators, and even a few modern translators, including the Authorized translators themselves. But it will not do. The Greek word never occurs in that sense.

The meaning of the whole verse is given by Alford (as he understands it) with his usual clearness: 'Every good gift (properly, *act of giving*) and every perfect gift (properly, *thing given*; but we cannot express the two by two words in English) descendeth from above, from the Father of the lights (it seems now generally agreed that by the lights here is meant the *heavenly bodies*, and by Father the creator, originator, as in Job xxxviii. 28, "*Who is the father of the rain?*" Being this, being the Father of those glorious fountains of light, and thus purer and clearer than they all, it cannot be that He should tempt to evil. Our very life, as renewed in Christ, is of His begetting, and we are a firstfruit of His new world), with ("chez," in the presence of) whom there is no change (none of that uncertainty of degree of light which we see in the material heavenly bodies, but which is not in God their Creator) or shadow (*a shadow*, the dark mark of shadow, the result of being over-

shadowed, and cast from any object) of turning (arising from turning—from that *revolution* in which the heavens are ever found: by means of which the moon turns her dark side to us, in a constant state of *change*, and *shadow of turning*: by means of which the moon is eclipsed by the shadow of the earth, and the sun by the body of the moon, or, if you will, though this is hardly so likely to have been in view, is hidden from us during the night. From all these God, the Father of lights, is free; as 1 John i. 5, "*God is light, and in him is no darkness at all*").'

Alford says that we have not English words with which to distinguish the act of giving from the thing given. And immediately after he had said it, the Revisers declared that we have, and offered 'gift' and 'boon.' But Alford was right. A gift is a boon and a boon is a gift; and these two words do not carry us the very least way towards the true distinction. Listen to Plumptre: 'The two nouns are different in the Greek, the first expressing the abstract act of giving, the second the gift as actually bestowed. The perfection of the one flows from the goodness of the other. The "perfect gift" carries our thoughts beyond all temporal blessings which, though good, have yet an element of incompleteness, to the greater gifts of righteousness and peace and joy; the gift, i.e. of the Holy Spirit, which is the crowning gift of all.'

No doubt that runs in the direction of homiletics. But the distinction is there. Hort also insists upon it; and in the adjectives he finds that while 'good' expresses 'the character of the gifts, derived from the Giver, "perfect" expresses the completeness of their operation when they are not misused.' Huther warns us against understanding by the one the gifts of nature or the present life and by the other the gifts of grace or the future life.

It is now generally agreed, says Alford, that 'the lights' (observe the *the*) are the heavenly bodies.

That is so. Yet Plumptre thinks otherwise. 'The plural' ('lights'), he says, 'is used to express the thought that light in all its forms, natural (as in the "great lights" of Ps. cxxvi. 7), intellectual, spiritual, is an efflux from Him "who is light, and in whom is no darkness at all." ' And Hort agrees to this extent that while he believes St. James calls God the Father (that is, the Creator) of the luminaries of the sky, he used such a word as would include all lights, and that invisible as well as visible. Then Knowling believes that 'St. James would not only remind his readers that if the lights of heaven, sun, moon, and stars brought such blessing to men, how much more He who made them; but he would again enforce the truth that if God was the source of all light, then we cannot refer sin to Him, the darkness which blinds the eyes of the soul and of the understanding.'

But all this is introductory. The difficulty of the verse is in the end of it: 'with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning,' as the Revised Version has it.

What is the 'shadow that is cast by turning'? What is it that turns? 'In considering the phrase,' says Bennett, 'we must, of course, dismiss from our minds our modern knowledge of astronomy, e.g. of the revolution of the earth on its axis, and its motion through an orbit round the sun. "Shadow cast by turning" could only mean to the readers the darkness in which the earth is plunged by the diurnal revolution or "turning" of the sun and moon round the earth—a special instance of "variation."

Beyond that none of the commentators have been able to go. The older men took it more astronomically than the modern see their way to. Bishop JEEB'S translation is 'with whom there is no parallax or tropical shadow.' And this is Doddridge's paraphrase: 'The sun itself is but a feeble image of His glory, *with whom there is no variableness, nor so much as any shadow of turning*; whereas the sun is continually varying,

and has no sooner arrived to its meridian, but it begins to descend to the west; or to its summer height, but it verges towards the winter again; causing the direction of the shadows it occasions proportionably to vary.'

This again is a trifle homiletical. Worse than that, it gives a precise sense to a word which was used quite generally. Mayor's paraphrase is very different. The meaning of the passage he takes to be: 'God is alike incapable of change in His own nature and incapable of being changed by the action of others.' And now we come to the discovery.

We have already seen that when Hort wrote his great Introduction in defence of his two choice manuscripts, he found that in one place only did they agree to go wrong, and that place is our verse. How did they go wrong? They gave the last word in the genitive (*ἀποσκιάσματος*) instead of the nominative (*ἀποσκίασμα*). Hort had various ingenious conjectures to account for the blunder, which do not concern us now. For it is no blunder.

A new volume has just appeared of the 'International Critical Commentary.' It is the volume on *The Epistle of St. James* (T. & T. Clark; 9s. net). The editor is Dr. James Hardy ROPES, Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard University. In issuing his commentary Professor Hardy ROPES acknowledges that 'it draws frankly from its predecessors, just as these in their turn used materials quarried by earlier scholars, whom they do not name on each occasion. The right to do this is won by conscientious effort in sifting previous collections and reproducing only what is trustworthy, apt, and instructive for the understanding of the text. If new illustrations or evidence can be added, that is so much to the good.' But he immediately adds: 'So far as I am aware, the solution I have given of the textual problem of 1⁷, the "shadow of turning," is strictly new.'

In what respect is it new? It is new in this that it takes the alternative conjunction (*ἢ*) as the definite article (*ἥ*), and keeps the last word in the genitive. This does not give a different sense. Of that there was no need. The translation is: 'with whom is none of the variation that belongs to (consists in, is observed in) the turning of the shadow.' But it vindicates the judgment of Westcott and Hort in their reliance upon *N* and *B*, and that in the most agreeable and conclusive manner.

The Gospels are biographies of the Christ. Do they include any autobiography? The Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, believes that they do. Dr. MURRAY has published a volume of *Studies in the Temptation of the Son of God* (Longmans; 2s. net). He believes that the narratives of the Temptation in the Wilderness are genuine bits of autobiography.

Dr. MURRAY does not look upon the temptations as outwardly historical events. The scenes depicted are scenes in a spiritual experience. No doubt, he says, the Lord was for a time actually in the wilderness. 'But there is no need to assume that Satan appeared to Him in a visible form; or that He was miraculously transported to stand in the flesh on the pinnacle of the Temple; or that there is any mountain on the surface of the globe from which it would be possible for human eyes to gaze on all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them.'

Even if the temptations had occurred outwardly as they are recorded, the account of them must have come from Christ Himself. There was no other there to witness them. Dr. MURRAY sees 'no reason to suppose that the early Christian Church possessed sufficient imaginative power to create such a story for itself, or would have chosen such a theme for its exercise had it possessed the power.'

But it is particularly agreeable to the synoptic

portrait to believe that He Himself threw His spiritual experiences into this outward shape. It is but a vivid example of the parabolic form of teaching. And Dr. MURRAY has no hesitation in understanding that the narratives of the Temptation contained in the First and Third Gospels both rest ultimately on accurate recollections of teaching actually given by our Lord Himself to His disciples.

They both rest on His own teaching. And yet they differ. They differ not a little in their language. And they differ in the order of the temptations, a difference that is extremely puzzling.

Dr. MURRAY follows St. Matthew's order. So do most expositors and preachers. But he is strongly drawn to the order of St. Luke. With Westcott he regards the Temptations in St. Luke's arrangement as 'exhibiting the stages of growing intensity in the trial, piercing deeper and deeper into the hidden world of personality within. The first assault came through the channel of the physical need of the body; the second was an appeal to human ambition through the imagination and feeling; the third was a temptation to spiritual presumption. They affect in turn our relation to ourselves, to the world, and to God.'

He might have added, had he observed it, that in appealing first to the appetites of the body, next to the desires of the imagination and emotions, and finally to the call of spiritual presumption, St. Luke's order of the temptations has a striking resemblance to the temptations of Eve. Eve saw that the tree was good for food; she saw that it was pleasant to the eyes; and she saw that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise. No doubt this agreement might be represented as intentional. St. Luke or the oral tradition he incorporated may have deliberately brought the temptations of the Son of Man into line with the temptations of the mother of us all. But the argument is just as strong the other way. It is

just as easy to say that the temptations did occur in St. Luke's order, or that they were related by our Lord in that order, so that no temptation to which the human race is liable might be omitted from the experience of Him who came to redeem it.

Even without observing the coincidence with Eve's temptations, Dr. MURRAY is so impressed with the suggestiveness of St. Luke's order that he believes our Lord told the story of the Temptation more than once, and that at one time He gave the order as we have it in St. Matthew's Gospel, at another as we find it in St. Luke's. For he cannot accept 'accidents' in the composition of the Gospels. 'They have meant so much for the life of the Church in the past, and must mean so much for the Church in every age, that what we are inclined to call "accidents" in their composition must still have been subject to a Divine overruling.' And he finds 'nothing improbable in the supposition that the Lord Himself must again and again have repeated the lesson to His disciples, varying the form in accordance with the special aspect of the experience which He wished to illustrate. If so, there is nothing extravagant in the suggestion that two of these forms have been preserved for our learning, to enable us to realize the many-sidedness, and the essentially spiritual character of the incident described.'

Can we do anything to prepare for the work that lies before us when the war is over? Can we do anything to prepare our people? Can we do anything to prepare ourselves?

A writer in the *Church Times* for 17th and 24th March thinks we can. He does not give his name. But he has spent many months, he says, with men of both the Old Army and the New, all of whom have been at the Front. 'The men belong to almost every rank of society and every regiment in the British Army; they include the

old Regular, the Territorial, and the men from Kitchener's Armies. They are of every age, from the recruit who, in his zeal to serve King and Country, has added a year or two to those he can legitimately claim, to the veteran who, for similar reasons, has docked his tale of years of perhaps some four or five.' And he has come to some conclusions about them.

The chief conclusion is that their religious education has been neglected. The secular education of some of them has also been neglected. He has come across men who find it difficult to write. Others have been well educated secularly, for they are of all ranks and professions. But the religious education of nearly all of them is an amazingly poor thing.

It is so poor that he has had to be careful with his questions. For example, it is very unwise, he says, to ask a man whether he is a communicant, as you may receive the startling reply, 'No, sir! Church of England.' Nor is it always safe to inquire as to whether they are confirmed, as, after some hesitation, you get some such answer as this: 'Well, sir, only two or three times!'

Their ignorance of Christian doctrine is as amazing as their ignorance of Church order. 'Again and again men will tell you what admirable lives they have led, especially if they can proudly claim the virtue of teetotalism; and if to this be added the heroic virtue of non-smoking, it is sometimes not very easy to find any point of approach; very commonly they summarize the whole situation by saying: "Well, sir, I never done anybody any 'arm in my life," and, hard as it is to believe, they are probably more or less sincere in this conviction.'

It may well be asked, says this anonymous and indignant writer, What sort of religion will these men demand when they return from the war? His answer is that 'in most cases they will demand something very different from that to

which they have been accustomed. They are frequently tired of the type of sermon which they have heard again and again and are perfectly willing to criticize. As one man said to me, "We do not want to be told to be good, what we do want is to be told how to be good." The sermon which takes the form of a second-rate literary essay with strong ethical tendencies is as useless as it is boring to men of this kind; what they crave for is systematic instruction, and it is this which the clergy either cannot or will not give them.'

He therefore proposes that, first of all, we should endeavour to teach them to pray. The Morning and Evening Prayer will not satisfy them. He is quite sure of that. Morning and Evening Prayer may be admirable exercises for those who know how to pray, but they do not know. 'A man said to me not long ago, "When I go to church on Sunday evening, I notice that the people kneel down before the service: I suppose they are saying their prayers. I should like to do the same, but I do not know what to say."

In the second place he suggests that in our preaching and in the lessons that we read we should make a clear distinction between the Old

Testament and the New. Hitherto he thinks we have made so little distinction that the men themselves make none. 'They believe that a literal acceptance of the Old Testament is an integral part of Christianity, and many of them are seriously affected by such grave problems as the difficulty of Cain's wife and cognate questions.'

He believes and he hopes that when the war is over and the men return they will demand a change, and with no uncertain voice. They will demand that 'the Old Testament should be put in its proper place, that the truths of redemption and the scheme of salvation as it is to be found in the Catholic Church should be substituted for outlines of Jewish history and tables of Israelitish kings, that their children from their earliest youth should be brought into touch with the supernatural by being present, week by week, at the Holy Eucharist, that they should be definitely and thoroughly instructed in the sacramental system as a whole, that they should be transported into that broader world which Christ opened up to all believers and in which the holy dead find place and the blessed saints are not forgotten. Perhaps they will ask for these things, perhaps they will not, but of one thing I have little doubt: that if they be offered them, they will not refuse them.'

The Mysticism of Greece.

BY ADELA MARION ADAM, M.A., LECTURER AT GIRTON AND NEWNHAM COLLEGES, CAMBRIDGE.

I.

THE mysticism of Greece may be studied broadly under two different aspects. On the one hand, we may investigate archaeologically various kinds of mystic worship, notably the rites established at Eleusis in Attica, the cult of Dionysus, the beliefs and ritual of the communities called Orphic and Pythagorean, and several forms of ecstatic religion prevailing in the later Græco-Roman world, and associated with the names of more Oriental deities

known as the Great Mother, Isis, Mithra, and others. Or, again, we may trace in great authors and thinkers the effect of the doctrines promulgated in mystic societies. The highest importance is to be assigned to this part of the subject. We cannot tell to what extent Plato, Pindar, Euripides, and Plotinus may have taken part in ceremonies requiring initiation; such scraps of evidence as we have (e.g., Porphyrius, *Vit. Plot.* 10) indicate that they

would have habitually stood aloof from popular cults; nevertheless in their works is to be found the abiding value of Greek mysticism. It seems desirable first briefly to sketch the history of early mystic religion in Greece, so far as recent research can help us to understand it, or, in default of certain knowledge, to form a reasonable conjecture about its development, and afterwards to see how the leaven of the mysteries worked in the minds of classical writers.

ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES.

The word *μύειν* means 'to shut,' and is applied to shutting the eyes or the mouth. From it are usually derived the words *μυεῖν*, 'to initiate'; *μύστης*, 'an initiated person'; *μυστήρια*, 'mystic' or 'secret rites,' because, as Eustathius (12th cent. A.D.) tells us, 'the initiated were bound to keep their mouths shut, and not to reveal the secret of their enlightenment.' Gilbert Murray translates Eur. *El.* 87 (*ἀφίγμαι ἐκ θεοῦ μυστηρίων*), 'I am come, fresh from the cleansing of Apollo,' thereby supporting a modern attempt to put forward seriously Clement of Alexandria's scoffing derivation of 'mysteries' from *μύσος*, 'pollution' (*Protr.* 12 [Potter]; see also Lydus, *de Mens.* iv. 38), on the ground that mysteries cleansed from pollution, but that etymology seems too much based on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle to meet with acceptance. It is true that purification played a leading part in the rites which were more often called by the Greeks *τελεταί*, 'rites of full initiation' (see J. E. Harrison, *C. R.* xxviii. [1914] 36), or *ὅργα*, 'rites of celebration,' than *μυστήρια*, 'rites of reverent silence,' and very probably they are right who see in the mysteries a survival of a primitive taboo, designed to protect the community from harm, by enjoining strict cleansing before the approach to sacred things, and forbidding their defilement by idle lips.

Theon Smyrnaeus (2nd cent. A.D.), in *de Util. Math.* 14 ff. (Hiller), gives several stages of initiation, of which the most important are the first, *καθαρός*, 'purification,' and the third, *ἐποπτεία*, 'beholding,' or 'vision,' which is followed by crowning with a wreath, and the possession of *εὐδαιμονία*, 'happiness,' acquired by communion with the divine. This late witness to happiness as the goal to be reached by the contemplation of mysteries is confirmed by the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (probably 7th cent. B.C.), which is the oldest source of

our knowledge of Eleusinian rites: 'Happy is he among dwellers of the earth who has beheld these things, but he who is without part or lot in sacred things hath not an equal destiny, when he be dead beneath the dusky gloom' (480 ff.).

Happiness, we see, is the assurance of salvation after death. Similarly, Sophocles proclaims: 'Thrice happy are those of mortal men who having seen these sacred rites go down to Hades, for theirs alone is life yonder, and there all evils are in store for others' (frag. 753 [Nauck]).

Pindar also (frag. 137 [Christ]) sings a like strain. Thus from the earliest moment when we catch a glimpse of Eleusis, through classical days and on to the latest age, the keynote of the mysteries was the blessedness of a future life for the initiated.

The hymn describes the search of Demeter, the earth-mother or corn-mother, for her daughter Core, whom she discovers to have been forcibly carried off to be the bride of the under-world god Hades. In the course of her wanderings she reveals herself to the Eleusinians, bids them build her a shrine, and promises to establish sacred rites (*ὅργα*). Zeus implores her to return to the abode of the gods, but she refuses, and sends a dearth upon the land, until her daughter shall revisit the earth. Then Hades yields to the importunity of Zeus to let Core go, but by giving her a pomegranate seed to eat he secures her return, and thenceforward she dwells a third part of the year with him and the rest with her mother and the other gods.

It is highly probable that this myth was developed from some early sympathetic magic for promoting fertility, but by the time the hymn was composed the ritual that can be traced in it of (a) purification by the use of fire (48, 239) and fasting (49), and (b) a sacred drink (*κυκεών*) of meal and water (208), had come to signify a promise of spiritual rather than material blessing to those who faithfully observed the ordinances.

No mention is made in the Homeric hymn of worship paid to any other deities but the mother, Demeter, and Core, the maiden. Accessory figures appear later, attested by the evidence of inscriptions and literature, and there are many problems relating to them, which need not concern us here. The husband of Core, Hades, plays a part, and it is in some manner not fully comprehensible to us, that, through Core's double character as the goddess of life-giving fertility and

queen of the under world, the initiated acquired their consciousness of happiness in the life to come. It should be noted with E. Rohde (*Psyche*², i. 294) that belief in a future existence was assumed beforehand by those who attended the mysteries. What they gained at Eleusis was the power of looking forward to that existence with a sure and certain hope. The hope must have increased in vividness, when, probably at some time between the date of the hymn and the battle of Salamis, the ritual was enriched by a Dionysiac spirit of worship. We are here on disputed ground. There is no doubt that a divine person named Iacchus, son of Core, was invoked by those who marched yearly to Eleusis from Athens in a torch-light procession. It is maintained by some that Iacchus is a purely Attic deity, having nothing to do with Dionysus, but the whole spirit of the chorus addressed to Iacchus, in Aristoph. *Frogs* (316-450), which is sung by a company of the 'pure initiated,' is in harmony with odes to Dionysus. Sophocles again (*Ant.* 1119 ff.; see also 1154 ff. and *Œd. Col.* 682 ff., with Jebb's note) sings of Bacchus as 'Thou who bearest sway in the gulf of Eleusinian Deo' (another name for Demeter), so that it is at least hardly doubtful that 5th cent. Greeks themselves fused the two divinities. Further, a scholiast on *Frogs*, 478, identifies Dionysus with Iacchus. It seems only natural therefore to account for the exaltation which filled the Eleusinian mystics as having its source in the power of Dionysus to impart to his votaries 'a share in the life of the God himself' (Rohde, ii. 14).

Statements are extant in abundance about details of the ritual, but they are apt to come from Christian Fathers with prejudiced minds or defective knowledge. What precisely happened in the hall (*τελεστήριον* = 'hall,' rather than 'temple') at Eleusis we cannot tell. Some sort of religious play, *δράμα μυστικόν*, was enacted; some sort of sacred symbols were displayed; some sacred cup was drunk. The point of importance for us is that the initiated took away with them a serener confidence. 'They do not have to learn anything,' says Aristotle, 'but to feel emotion and be in the right frame of mind, that is to say, when they have become suitable subjects' (frag. 45 [Bonitz]).

The last words in this quotation do not seem to be noted as often as they deserve. It is not to be expected that the religious fervour and imaginative susceptibility of all the crowd that attended the Eleusinia reached the highest level, but the long

life of the mysteries, extending to the end of the 4th cent. A.D., and the influence which they exerted on Christian ritual (see E. Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and usages upon the Christian Church* [H.L.], London, 1890) show that the spirit of devotion was by no means perfunctory.

All Greeks (Herod. viii. 65), men, women, and sometimes slaves (Aristid. *Eleus.* i. 257 [Jebb]; *C.I.A.* 834 b, c), were admitted to the Eleusinian mysteries, contrary to the rule prevailing for other mysteries, both in Athens and elsewhere in Greece, except as regards the Lesser Mysteries held in February at Agræ, an Athenian suburb on the Ilissus, on the side of the city farthest from Eleusis. Here candidates were required to go through a preliminary initiation. In the September following a candidate might share in the rites of purification, sacrifice, and fasting, which are celebrated in Athens on the first three days of the Greater Mysteries, and might go to Eleusis for the first time, but would not be admitted to the most sacred part of the ceremonies. Next year he, or she, might repeat the pilgrimage and become an *ἐπόπτης*.

The difficulty of ascertaining the procedure at Agræ is even greater than at Eleusis. Core was the chief figure. Efforts to find Dionysus in the ritual rest on very slender and late evidence, and on a dubious interpretation of an Athenian painting. The Lesser Mysteries were probably a relic of the time when Athens and Eleusis, being separate states, had each their own Core-cult. The prestige of the Eleusinian rites caused the Athenians to maintain them as the principal festival, placing, however, both centres under state management. Mysteries abounded in all parts of Greece, some of them offshoots of Eleusis—e.g., at Celeæ—others independent and in honour of other gods—e.g. at Samothrace, where the Kabeiroi were worshipped.

THE WORSHIP OF DIONYSUS.

In the 6th cent. B.C. there began to appear in Greece the cult of Dionysus or Bacchus, who is mentioned in Homer, though seldom. Thrace was the country of his origin, so far back as we can discover it, and to this day a very curious mumming play, reminiscent of Dionysiac myth, survives there (R. M. Dawkins, in *J.H.S.* xxvi. [1906] 191). It may be, however, that Crete was a still earlier home; that question must be discussed presently. Herodotus (iv. 79) strikes the

keynote of the character of Dionysus: 'this god who leads men on to madness.' Torch-light revels on the mountain-side, music of flutes, cymbals, and tambourines, wild dance, and ecstasy were the means by which the worshippers endeavoured to enhance their sense of the presence of the god.

No deity is more manifold in his aspects than Dionysus. First and foremost he is the god of ecstasy. Life, energy, fertility, vegetation are his special province. In alternate years he disappears from mankind to dwell in the under world, being the lord of all souls. To celebrate his 'epiphany' (*ἐπιφάνεια*) trieteric (*i.e.*, taking place every other year) festivals were held. Thus Dionysus was a nether as well as an upper god, and by communion with him his votaries strove with frenzied longing to attain immortality, for only by becoming themselves divine could mortals escape death. The dancers might descry the god in their midst in animal form, especially as a bull, or else 'Dread voices as of bulls bellow, whence coming none can see' (Æschylus, describing Thracian Dionysus [frag. 57 [Nauck]]). Or, again, they might fall on some animal meet for sacrifice, a kid or bull, and in frantic haste would tear him piecemeal, and feast upon his raw flesh, identifying the victim with the god with whom they yearned to be one. Such rites earned for a Thracian tribe from Herodotus (iv. 93) the name of *oi ἀθανάτοις*, people who make themselves immortal.

From Thrace the cult of Dionysus spread through Greece and Asia Minor. In Greece proper there are legendary tales of fierce resistance to the new religion, whose spirit of unbridled orgy accorded ill with the Greek tone of restraint in

matters of worship as in other things. But the appeal made by Dionysus to the desire instinctive in all mankind to overstep human limitations and partake of divine eternity was too strong for suppression by rulers. Everywhere he made converts among the women, and it is hardly necessary to refer to the *Bacchæ* of Euripides as reaching high-water mark among pictures of these enthusiasts in the literal sense of the Greek word—*i.e.*, human beings rapt into the godhead, *ἐνθεοι, ἐνθουρίσασι*. The worship made its way, casting its spell over men as well as women and winning State recognition, but at the same time becoming more subdued. In passing southwards to a vine-growing country, Dionysus took on a new character as the kindly giver of wine that maketh glad the heart of man, 'the fruit of the vine that makes the troubles of mortals to cease' (Eur. *Bacch.* 772). It is easy to see how readily wine with its exciting properties should come to be associated with a god the very essence of whose service demanded a mood of exaltation in his followers. But, though we hear of orgiastic festivals in historical times in Greece (Paus. VIII. vi. 5, and often), official cults of Dionysus, especially in Athens, developed into well-ordered sacrificial, musical, and dramatic celebrations. At Delphi the frenzy of the priestess who uttered the oracles shows the influence of Dionysus, and all the sibyls and seers, who, though known to us only through legends, doubtless really wandered about Greece, prophesying as the spirit moved them, were imbued with his spirit, as were also the wizard purifiers such as Epimenides, who worked through ecstatic inspiration.

The Revelation of God in Christ.

BY THE REV. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.PHIL., D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY,
NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

GOD revealed in Jesus Christ—this idea is one which, judging by the quite natural difficulties felt upon the subject, requires no little explanation. All sorts of puzzles have accumulated round it. All kinds of objection have been raised to its validity, and the proofs led in its defence have occasionally been wrong-headed or irrelevant.

To hold that in Christ we see God revealed is to

hold that if we Christians examine our own minds with regard to the content we ascribe to 'God'—a term which, be it remembered, has borne and still bears a hundred different meanings—it transpires that we have carried over to God the moral attributes of Christ. God, in other words, is exactly like Jesus. No one really has ever believed that the world explains itself, or doubted that above or

behind this phenomenal system of things and incidents there exists *some* ultimate or supreme Power. The seen manifests the Unseen. But that Power has been described by many thinkers as Fate or Chance, by others as a mixture of Evil with Good, by some few as Unconscious Will. Christians refuse these descriptions, not arrogantly indeed or jauntily or coldly, but with intense conviction. They are persuaded that God is better than them all, because He is specifically the Power present in Christ. Our experience of Christ imprints this on our minds as self-attesting truth. Hence for us to think of God is to think of Christ with His essential characteristics exalted to infinitude.

Now the revelation mediated by Christ is one calculated to meet and satisfy our religious needs. And it is constituted by this purpose. Jesus puts the Father within our reach, as faithfully and unchangeably Redeemer, and for those who have to live in a world of sin, transience and darkness, that means everything. The questions about God solved by the fact of Christ are questions not primarily of the intelligence but of the soul. That implies that various problems concerned with God are as inscrutable to the Christian as to the Shintoist; that faith, for example, gives no light on how God made the world or upholds it in being. These and other like matters are still opaque. What Jesus has done is so to unveil the Father that we have communion with Him. He enables us not to write essays about God, but dwell under His shadow. There is nothing made known in Christ which relieves men of the fog of thinking hard when they want to clarify their minds about all kinds of difficulty arising out of reflexion upon human life. The aim of revelation is a quite specific one. It is to rectify our personal relation to God by showing the Father in such a light as will bring us into fellowship with Him.

In that case, revelation cannot possibly be the same thing as the communication of theoretic statements about the Divine Being. Not even such statements with Divine authority to back them would avail, any more than to have read a man's autobiography entitles us to claim his friendship. There is nothing in doctrine as a purely objective affirmation of truth to guarantee God's personal interest in and love for me or to give me freedom of access to His heart. Nor is there anything in doctrine, still regarded in this light, which enables me to verify it in the daily life of faith. It is out-

side experience, with no chance thus far of getting inside. But if it should meet us in the living guise of a Person, if the truth should be embodied in a tale, the case is different. For this Person may be self-evidencing, and to look at Him with our nature laid open to His influence may change us through and through. That is what Christians testify has happened to them in Jesus' presence. Bowed before Him, they have come to know what God thinks of them and how He is even ready to suffer on their behalf. Through One whose influence over us is independent of time we find ourselves actually led to the Father. Even the word 'revelation' may seem inadequate to the great truth. It is not that we place Jesus alongside of God, and bridge the distance between them by an inference. We do not argue from one to the other at all; we are made immediately aware that in this Man God is personally present.

People occasionally speak as if all this involved an absolutely new and unfamiliar principle. That, however, is not the case, and in fact an idea which was completely new would have no reality our minds could apprehend. It is worth pointing out, therefore, that as life proceeds we all of us, even apart from Christ, have revelations of higher truth, and that these revelations come through the spiritual impression made by persons. We believe, for example, in Friendship. We are sure there is such a thing as Friendship, that it has been manifested in indisputable ways, that it is the most precious thing in all the world. Why do we believe this? Because we have encountered those who exhibit its reality in their attitude and bring it in upon us as undeniable fact, undeniable at the very time when we seek to thrust it aside. That is a revelation, and persons are the medium. So too with Holiness. We are certain that Holiness is not a mere abstract noun, absurd and empty, but the most subduing and august of realities, because we have met and known those who are holy. The thing is quite easily distinguishable from all imitations, and when we come face to face with it we bow our heads in reverence and wonder. This also is a revelation, conveyed by the instrumentality of persons. Essentially in the same way, though on an infinite scale and with perfect efficacy, what Jesus is reveals the fact and the presence of God. He does not tell us about God merely; He draws us to behold Him, and by the sight we are changed. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' is

the plainest transcript of life. It is not something we are to believe because Jesus said it; it is what our experience of Jesus means.

What, then, are the main features in the impression of God we receive from Christ? Let us take Christ at one particular point in His career and do with it as men do with a noble picture—stand before it, and let its meaning sink into our mind. Let us select His attitude to the woman that was a sinner. It is instinct, for one thing, with that Love to which we give the high name of Grace. She was an outcast, but Jesus went much further than to touch her; He suffered her to touch Him. The delicacy of His feeling, His kindness, His longing to uplift and console and heal, His sympathy with the fallen one, His trust in her repentance—this was wholly unprecedented in her life, and it made all things new. She felt, without reasoning, that in Jesus she was meeting that than which nothing can be higher, and that when He said 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven,' it was the voice of God. But observe, this Love, so gentle with the sinner, is none the less implacable to sin. It is a holy Love. Stained men and women, now as in the first century, are confounded and humbled by that stainlessness, which not only evokes a sense of ill-desert, but imparts both depth and passion to their penitence. A man cannot take down the Gospels and use half an hour in reading three chapters of Jesus' life without arriving at certain absolute conclusions, and of these one is that God is holy. It is from Jesus we gain that certainty. His eyes look out upon us from the page, and through them shines, inescapably, the holiness of God.

Antecedently we might suppose that Love and Holiness are incompatible in their supreme form. In our acquaintance sympathy and righteousness do not always go together. Holiness, men have often believed, is the attribute which puts sinners at a distance and keeps them there. And certainly none were so sure as the guilty who approached Jesus that He could make no terms with sin in a disciple's life. And yet, having sought them out, He stayed on beside them with a personal concern which was at once appeal and promise. So that it is only when Love and Holiness fall short of perfectness that they move apart and issue in antagonism; then Love becomes weak, and Holiness grows coldly exclusive. But in God, in Jesus who is the image of God, they are as inseparably one as the

concave and convex aspects of a curve, and the Holiness by which we are abased is one thing with the Love that lifts us up and makes our moral being rejoice.

To see Jesus, therefore, is to become aware of that Holiness and Love *in excelsis* which for Christians are the equivalent of the moral nature of God. He is their presentation in history. But, as we believe, God is more than Holy Love, He is Holy Love which is *almighty*. Can this further element be derived from Jesus Christ, that is, from the immediate impression left upon us by the Gospel picture of His life? The difficulty at this point is greater.

In one sense, indeed, there is no difficulty at all. It is clear that Jesus conceived the Father as omnipotent, and in this respect shared the highest faith of the Old Testament. It is little indeed to say that He shared that faith. To quote a recent writer: 'One cannot make an unprejudiced examination of the Gospels without being astonished to find how enormously important for Jesus' view of God was His impression of God's omnipotence and infinite sublimity. I am very far from failing to recognize that in His apprehension of God Fatherly love constituted the central feature. But the importance of this extraordinary fact can be rightly appreciated only so long as one realizes that His view of God did not emphasize the Divine power, majesty, and sublimity one whit less than did the Jewish view, but took the latter for granted—nay more, deepened it and intensified it to the absolute uttermost.' But assuming this, we have still to ask whether the sense of God as almighty which Jesus gives is differently conditioned from our sense of His holiness and love, in this respect that whereas the holiness and love of God come home to us directly in Jesus' presence, as intuitively apprehended in our very apprehension of what Jesus is and does, the truth of Divine omnipotence is mediated only through what Jesus believed and said. In that case, our faith simply rests on *His* faith. But I think that we are really able to go further. For one thing, power is itself a manifest element in Jesus' work. Though we leave aside nature miracles as disputable (many of His healing works, in point of fact, are as wonderful as any nature miracle), the redeeming energies He brought to bear on men in performing upon them the comprehensive miracle of salvation do indicate such power as only needs to be raised to the absolute

scale to represent Divine omnipotence. Men upon whom Jesus laid His saving hand became aware that there was power in Him, as well as holiness and love, which spontaneously led their minds to God and gave them a quite definite conception of what God can do. And if it be replied to this that such a direct impression of power concerns the spiritual realm merely, and is irrelevant to the physical universe, our answer is that faith rightly declines to separate the two. The universe is one, and if it is such as to admit of a Person almighty in His character as Saviour from sin and sorrow, those spiritual energies in Him which reveal God must in God be accompanied by unlimited powers also over nature. The thought is not so much logical inference as rather a movement of believing intuition. The redeeming might of God presented in Jesus is master of natural law.

Now this compound yet simple conception of Almighty and Holy Love is precisely what we Christians mean by God. Its constitutive significance is all present in Jesus, and is nowhere else fully present in history or nature. This is the meaning of our immemorial belief that God is revealed, and, for the purposes of religious faith, perfectly revealed in the historic Christ. The knowledge of God indispensable for a life of peace and joy cannot be gained by hard thinking, or by scientific inquiry, or by the scrutiny of our own constitution; it can be gained only by laying bare our moral nature to the impression left by Jesus in the Gospels. We find in God nothing else than Christ.

To this revelation there belong certain conditions or attributes which it is worth while to set out in distinct terms.

(a) At every point it is mediated through ethical experience. It comes to us through the living and breathing substance of free and unselfish motive, not invading personality, not forcing or outraging conscience, but winning us by being what it is and shining solely in its own light. Had revelation consisted in the imposition of divers theorems concerning God, belief in which was prescribed as the gate of entrance for all, religion would have unequivocally defined itself as the foe of morality, for such an externally authorized creed, depressing by its very mysteriousness, would have added to our load, not lessened it. But what we see in Christ imposes its truth upon us freely; it is echoed by the voice of conscience; it evokes just such a

belief and loyal confidence as a man has in his friend. The human spirit is never so much at liberty as in the moment of joyful response to Christ's presentation of the Father.

(b) Revelation is supernatural in quality and range. By this I mean that it is something which no phenomenal realities of our normal world can explain in the very least. The communion of God with men through Jesus is miraculous in the sense that nothing explains it save the intervention of the living God in a sense not to be accounted for by the resident forces of human life, or the intramundane causal nexus. God acts freely in unbaring to us His heart; He releases into the phenomenal order the stored-up energies of His grace; and this is borne in upon us convincingly by the fact of Christ. But revelation is not miraculous in the sense that it discards finite media. Jesus, too, is part of the world. When God poured the fulness of His being in Christ, it was a living intrusion in the human sphere, in ways not derivable from known laws or the given phases of the universe.

(c) The vehicle of revelation is history. To-day fewer men than ever profess to find a saviour God in Nature, but there are still those who would call or recall us to the ideals of Reason, with the promise of perfect satisfaction. But the impotence of ideals to produce their own actualization is the theme of moralists ancient and modern, great and small. Can any one feel the value of sobriety like the drunkard; is any less inclined to deny the loftiness or the necessity of self-control than he? Now one truth humanity is slowly learning—Christians have known it from the first—is that history is immeasurably richer in impulse and contribution than any single life. The victorious *differentia* of our religion is that it is no system of ideas or ideals suggested by the Spirit to the souls of men, but a story of definite acts done by God before men's eyes. Redemption is mediated through One who belonged to our own sphere of reality, who trod the earth our feet are treading now, who lay down in the grave and on Easter morning broke the power of death. Christianity has the life-blood of fact in its veins. The preacher is able to stand up and preach not what he feels, but what God has done.

(d) Revelation is an appeal to faith. In other words, it speaks with a resounding voice, but only faith can hear. There is no automatic action

of the Divine self-unveiling on the soul, and if people want to shut their eyes to God's presence in Christ, they can shut them. The impression is made solely on the right kind of mind, the mind that hopes there is a God, and hopes, too, that He will lift the veil and betray His purpose. That is a principle not in the least confined to the religious life. It holds good equally of art. The meaning of a great picture or a great symphony is not the creation of the susceptible spirit to which it is presented, but without susceptibility of spirit, without the right kind of mind, no impression at all will be made.

Theology has not greatly inclined to deny the fact that God is revealed in Christ; what it has often done is to cancel this truth either by taking its point of departure elsewhere than in Christ, or by admitting as equally valuable sources of revelation other fields of experience which belong to a lower ethical plane, such as Nature or the general history of the world. It cannot be too strongly asserted that a Christian's only legitimate method is to make Christ the starting-point, thus

ensuring that His influence shall fix once for all the main outlines of our thought of God. Anything else is to court disaster. Moreover, the revelation of God in Christ has no need to be improved upon. Had improvement been called for, we may well believe it would not have been withheld; but in point of fact no vital element has ever been added to the conception of the Father as imaged in Christ. What has happened is a vastly extended application of principles first embodied in His person. It is still as true as in the first century that Jesus 'reflects God's bright glory and is stamped with God's own character' (He 1⁸). Nothing can be allowed to interfere with this—not science, or philosophy, or non-Christian religions. Christ is the revelation of God our Father—final, unsurpassable, and, in a sense which faith quite well understands, absolute. All that we have to say (and it is much) about the unveiling of God in the Old Testament, in the course of history and the constitution of man, or in the world of Nature, must be subsumed under, and controlled by, the self-delineation He has given in our Lord.

Literature.

THE PLACE OF VIOLENCE

A TRANSLATION into English has been made of *Reflections on Violence*, by Georges Sorel (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is a demand for the use of violence as the only method worth using in the warfare between labour and capital. Let us see what it is that M. Sorel expects in the future.

'Socialism tends to appear more and more as a theory of revolutionary syndicalism—or rather as a philosophy of modern history, in as far as it is under the influence of this syndicalism. It follows from these incontestable data, that if we desire to discuss Socialism with any benefit, we must first of all investigate the functions of violence in actual social conditions.'

The argument in favour of violence is that it succeeds. 'One of the things which appear to me to have most astonished the workers during the last few years has been the timidity of the forces of law and order in the presence of a riot; magistrates who have the right to demand the services

of soldiers dare not use their power to the utmost, and officers allow themselves to be abused and struck with a patience hitherto unknown in them. It is becoming more and more evident every day that working-class violence possesses an extraordinary efficacy in strikes.'

But violence—we continue to quote M. Sorel—violence is good for the world. 'It seems to be the only means by which the European nations—at present stupefied by humanitarianism—can recover their former energy.' Proletarian violence, carried on as a pure and simple manifestation of the sentiment of the class war, appears thus as a very fine and very heroic thing; it is at the service of the immemorial interests of civilisation.

The syndicalist, however, must not be called a patriot. 'Syndicalists do not propose to reform the State, as the men of the eighteenth century did; they want to destroy it.'

What method does the syndicalist propose to take in order to set his violence to work? The answer is, a general strike. 'Every time that we

attempt to obtain an exact conception of the ideas behind proletarian violence we are forced to go back to the notion of the general strike.'

'The possibility of the realisation of the general strike has been much discussed ; it has been stated that the Socialist war could not be decided in one single battle. To the people who think themselves cautious, practical, and scientific the difficulty of setting great masses of the proletariat in motion at the same moment seems prodigious ; they have analysed the difficulties of detail which such an enormous struggle would present. It is the opinion of the Socialist-sociologists, as also of the politicians, that the general strike is a popular dream, characteristic of the beginnings of a working-class movement ; we have had quoted against us the authority of Sidney Webb, who has decreed that the general strike is an illusion of youth, of which the English workers—whom the monopolists of sociology have so often presented to us as the depositaries of the true conception of the working-class movement—soon rid themselves.'

But Georges Sorel has no opinion of Sidney Webb. ' Sidney Webb enjoys a reputation for competence which is very much exaggerated ; all that can be put to his credit is that he has waded through uninteresting blue-books, and has had the patience to compose an extremely indigestible compilation on the history of trades unionism ; he has a mind of the narrowest description, which could only impress people unaccustomed to reflection.'

What of the ethics of this grand scheme (for grand it is in M. Sorel's eyes—' a serious, formidable and sublime work ') ? The ethics are somewhat mixed. He will have nothing to do with brutality—leaves that to the capitalist—but the carrying of a weapon and the readiness to use it are virtues. ' P. Bureau was extremely surprised to find in Norway a rural population which had remained profoundly Christian. The peasants, nevertheless, carried a dagger at their belt ; when a quarrel ended in a stabbing affray, the police enquiry generally came to nothing for lack of witnesses ready to come forward and give evidence.' M. Sorel approves of the conclusion of P. Bureau : ' In men, a soft and effeminate character is more to be feared than their feeling of independence, however exaggerated and brutal, and a stab given by a man who is virtuous in his morals, but violent, is a social evil less serious and more easily curable

than the excessive profligacy of young men reputed to be more civilised.'

M'CALL THEAL'S SOUTH AFRICA.

Messrs. Allen & Unwin have begun to republish at a cheaper price Dr. George M'Call Theal's *History of South Africa from 1795 to 1872*. The first two volumes have been issued (7s. 6d. net each). This is the fourth edition of the book, and it has been carefully revised and enlarged.

There is no occasion to describe the history now. It has taken its place in all historical libraries. Not only is it the best history of South Africa on a large scale ; it is one of the best histories in the language. Not that Dr. Theal has the captivating style of a Gibbon or a Froude. Better than that, he has the fulness of knowledge, the width of sympathy, the freedom from prejudice which are so much rarer in historians than a fine style. He holds us when he has once caught our attention, and we know that what we are learning we shall never have to unlearn. Not only are the facts well verified, the whole atmosphere is properly adjusted. We hear the South Africans speak, we see them act, we enter into their very thought. This is the way of the purely historical narrative. No explanations or reflections are required on the part of the historian, any more than they are required from the novelist ; the whole situation is made ours by means of the simple narrative of fact.

The work will be complete as before in five volumes. It will contain fifteen maps and charts.

THE MODERN STUDY OF LITERATURE.

Does the study of literature as *literature* do us any good ? It is like asking, What is proved by the *Tempest* ? But apply it to the Bible—for Dr. Richard Green Moulton, Professor of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, has written much on the literary structure of the Bible. Does it do us any good to study the purely literary questions that may be asked about the Psalms or the Prophecies of Isaiah ? Does it help us to understand Isaiah ? Does it help us to find instruction in the Psalter ?

The answer is that all knowledge is helpful. We are made up of parts, as St. Paul has told us, head and heart and hand, and no part comes to its own

without calling in the aid of all other parts. Edification is a matter mainly of the emotions, is it? But the understanding must supply the emotions with food. Isaiah did not find his thoughts run into the form which his prophecies assumed without thinking about the form. All his faculties, we may well believe, came at the call of his imagination—the love of his heart, the surrender of his will, the constructive and corrective powers of his intellect. And if we are to enter into the inheritance which he has bequeathed us, we must exercise the intellect upon the construction of his poetry as well as the heart upon the love of God.

And it is so with all literature. What does Shakespeare's *Tempest* prove? It proves that Shakespeare could not have written the *Tempest* without knowing that there are laws of composition and obeying them. These laws we must learn and know in order that we may appreciate the *Tempest* and gain the good of it. To that end, and to a much larger end than that, a book has been written by Professor Moulton on *The Modern Study of Literature* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 10s. net).

LUTHER.

The fifth volume of the English translation of Professor Hartmann Grisar's *Luther* has been published (Kegan Paul; 12s. net). It is a volume of more than 600 octavo pages, and much of it is printed with a small type. Of quantity for the money there is no lack.

Nor of quality. This is by far the most agreeable volume of the work, as yet published. Is it possible that as Dr. Grisar proceeded with his biography he came to appreciate Luther's worth? Is it possible that he came to love him? One thing is certain. He has more joy now in disposing of the foolish fictions about Luther which he finds so freely scattered throughout the Roman Catholic works which he has consulted. 'Certain controversialists,' he says, 'have alleged' that Luther came outspokenly to disown his doctrine and his work; they tell us that he expressed his regret for ever having undertaken the religious innovation. Words are even quoted as his which furnish "the tersest condemnation of the Reformation by the Reformer himself." No genuine utterances of his to this effect exist.' And having said that, he goes right into the whole subject, turns up

every reference and verifies every quotation, and knocks that lie on the head.

More than that, Professor Grisar appreciates Luther. He appreciates some of the very characteristics which his fellow Roman Catholics have found most offensive. He appreciates his humour. A considerable section is given to the exposition (and enjoyment!) of Luther's fun. We must quote its introduction:

'Joking was a permanent element of Luther's psychology. Often, even in his old age, his love of fun struggles through the lowering clouds of depression and has its fling against the gloomy anxiety that fills his mind, and against the world and the devil.

'Gifted with a keen sense of the ridiculous, it had been, in his younger days, almost a second nature to him to delight in drollery and particularly to clothe his ideas in playful imagery. His mind was indeed an inexhaustible source of rich and homely humour.

'Nature had indeed endowed Luther from his cradle with that rare talent of humour which, amidst the trials of life, easily proves more valuable than a gold mine to him who has it. During his secular studies at Erfurt he had been able to give full play to this tendency as some relief after the hardships of early days. His preference for Terence, Juvenal, Plautus and Horace amongst the classic poets leads us to infer that he did so; and still more does Mathesius's description, who says that, at that time, he was a "brisk and jolly fellow." Monastic life and, later, his professorship and the strange course on which he entered must for a while have placed a rein on his humour, but it broke out all the more strongly when he brought his marvellous powers of imagination and extraordinary readiness in the use of the German tongue to the literary task of bringing over the masses to his new ideas.

'Anyone desirous of winning the hearts of the German masses has always had to temper earnestness with jest, for a sense of humour is part of the nation's birthright. The fact that Luther touched this chord was far more efficacious in securing for him loud applause and a large following than all his rhetoric and theological arguments.'

COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

Mr. Louis Henry Jordan, B.D., has given his life to the furtherance of the study of Comparative

Religion. Some years ago he published a large volume with the title of *Comparative Religion: its Genesis and Growth*. He has now published another volume just as large, with the title of *Comparative Religion: its Adjuncts and Allies* (Oxford University Press; 12s. net). And he has two similar volumes coming, one *Comparative Religion: its Meaning and Value*; the other *Comparative Religion: its Principles and Problems*.

The volume just published has the appearance, when you open it, of a literary review. And it is a review. Book after book and periodical after periodical published within recent years and in any way touching the study of religion have been described. No immodest pretence is made of ability to criticize them all; but they have all been described accurately, so that the student of any part of the great field sees at once and sees unmistakably what is being done and who is doing it.

When the occasion seems to require it Mr. Jordan does not hold his hand from criticism. Strongly convinced of the right of every religion to be called a religion, and even as it seems of the impossibility of speaking of any religion, even Christianity, as *the* religion, he criticizes Dr. W. St. Clair Tisdall pretty severely. 'He seeks really to set the Christian faith upon a lofty and imposing pedestal which will lift it high above all its predecessors and contemporaries, while the weaknesses of all other religions are ruthlessly sought out, and as ruthlessly exposed to view.'

Well, it is true enough, and deplorably true, that some men are so nervous about Christianity that they make blind and foolish statements against all other faiths. There is only one way of proving Christianity the only true religion. That is by giving every religion freedom of comparison beside it. *Solvitur ambulando.*

THE JOURNAL OF JOHN WESLEY.

The seventh volume has been published of the standard edition of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (Kelly). It is a fine volume of 528 pages and contains twenty illustrations.

Here are three paragraphs worth taking a note of:

'June 1785, Tues. 28.—By the good providence of God, I finished the eighty-second year of my age. Is anything too hard for God? It is now eleven years since I have felt any such thing as weariness. Many times I speak till my voice fails, and I can

speak no longer; frequently I walk till my strength fails, and I can walk no farther; yet even then I feel no sensation of weariness, but am perfectly easy from head to foot. I dare not impute this to natural causes; it is the will of God.'

'Sept. 1785, Sun. 4.—Finding a report had been spread abroad that I was just going to leave the Church, to satisfy those that were grieved concerning it I openly declared in the evening that I had now no more thought of separating from the Church than I had forty years ago.'

'April 1786, Mon. 3.—About eleven I preached to a crowded congregation in the new house near Chapel-en-le-Frith. Many of these lively people came from among the mountains, and strongly reminded me of those fine verses wherein Dr. Burton paraphrases those plain words, "The hills are a refuge for the wild goats; and so are the stony rocks for the conies":

Te, domine, intonsi montes, te saxa loquentur
Summa Deum, dum montis amat juga pendulus
hircus,
Saxorumque colit latebrosa cuniculus antra.

'It is chiefly among these enormous mountains that so many have been awakened, justified, and soon after perfected in love; but, even while they are full of love, Satan strives to push many of them to extravagance. This appears in several instances: (1) Frequently three or four, yea, ten or twelve, pray aloud all together. (2) Some of them, perhaps many, scream all together as loud as they possibly can. (3) Some of them use improper, yea, indecent, expressions in prayer. (4) Several drop down as dead; and are as stiff as a corpse; but in a while they start up, and cry, "Glory! glory!" perhaps twenty times together. Just so do the French Prophets, and very lately the Jumpers in Wales, bring the real work into contempt. Yet, whenever we reprove them, it should be in the most mild and gentle manner possible.'

The notes are as interesting as ever. Take this as evidence: 'On an undated journey from Redruth to St. Ives, via Hayle, occurred Peter Martin's dramatic incident of driving Wesley through the tide that he might keep his appointment at St. Ives. Samuel Dunn, who may be regarded as a credible witness, published this remarkable story in the *Wesley Banner*, vol. i. p. 49. At the crisis of peril, with the tumultuous waters around the carriage, Wesley quite calmly hailed the driver, asking his

name, who answered, "Peter." "Peter," said Wesley, "fear not; thou shalt not sink." With vigorous spurring and whipping Peter again urged on the flagging horses, and at last got safely over—by miracle, as he always said. Both Wesley and his driver were drenched. When they reached St. Ives Wesley's first care was to see Peter comfortably lodged at the tavern: "He procured me warm clothes, a good fire, and excellent refreshments. Neither were the horses forgotten by him. Totally unmindful of himself, he proceeded, wet as he was, to the chapel, and preached according to his appointment." As was so frequently the case in the tragedies and heroisms of his life, Wesley made no mention of this incident either in his published Journal or in his private Diary. We owe this information to the fact that Samuel Dunn met Peter Martin in his vigorous old age.'

CORNARO.

'He asked life of thee and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever.' That is more than Luigi Cornaro could give or could promise to give. But he could promise length of days here on earth. He enjoyed more than a hundred years of life himself, and at the end of the hundred he wrote a great book on the art of living long, a book which has become a classic. His book has had its translators from the Italian into other languages. A carefully revised English version has now been published by Mr. William F. Butler of Milwaukee, under the title of *The Art of Living Long*. 'As a result of painstaking researches among ancient documents in the archives of Venice and Padua, historical matter relating to Cornaro and his family is also placed before the reader. Much of this is not to be found in any previous edition of his works; in the various languages into which they have been rendered.'

Cornaro's work does not fill quite a hundred pages of Mr. Butler's book. For Mr. Butler's object is to edit Cornaro and at the same time advocate Cornaro's principles. Accordingly he makes appropriate quotations from Joseph Addison, Francis Bacon, and Sir William Temple. He even gives us excellent portraits of those three great ones.

But what was Cornaro's recipe for long life? Exercise, first of all, and chiefly. After that, diet. He did not believe in doctors, because one man cannot know another man's digestion; every man

must study his own. Once Cornaro believed that what his appetite enjoyed his digestion must find easy. He discovered that it was not so. 'It is true, however,' he says, 'that besides these two very important rules which I have always so carefully observed, relative to eating and drinking,—namely, to take only the quantity which my stomach can easily digest and only the kinds that agree with it,—I have also been careful to guard against great heat and cold, as well as extreme fatigue or excesses of any nature; I have never allowed my accustomed sleep and rest to be interfered with; I have avoided remaining for any length of time in places poorly ventilated; and have been careful not to expose myself too much to the wind or the sun; for these things, too, are great disorders. Yet it is not a very difficult matter to avoid them; for, in a being endowed with reason, the desire of life and health possesses greater weight than the mere pleasure of doing things which are known to be hurtful.'

Mr. Butler has published a companion to Luigi Cornaro's *Art of Living Long*. The one has to do with the body, the other with the soul. The volume entitled '*He shall speak Peace*' consists of quotations from the Bible, occupying all the odd pages and printed in large type, with quotations from other books occupying all the even pages and printed in small type.

The quotations are gathered into groups, each group's sentences having some affinity; but those on one page seem to have no relation to those on the opposite page. There are many ways of making books; this is one of them. The frontispiece is a photographic reproduction of Anton Dietrich's picture, 'Peace, be still.'

SHAKESPEARE AND WAR.

Mrs. C. C. Stopes, who published a large and original book quite recently on Shakespeare's Environment, has now published a book on *Shakespeare's Industry*, quite as large and quite as original (Bell; 7s. 6d. net). This is an achievement. It is easy enough to write a book on Shakespeare. But to be one's self and worth reading through three hundred and fifty octavo pages, that is not easy.

The topics are many. 'Shakespeare's Industry' is only the first of them. After it comes 'Shakespeare's Treatment of his Originals,' 'the Amleth of the Story and the Hamlet of the Stage,' 'Hamlet

and Macbeth, an Intended Contrast,' 'the Scottish and English Macbeth,' 'Is Lady Macbeth really a "Fiendlike Queen"?' , and many more, up to twenty-three chapters.

The sixteenth chapter is on 'Shakespeare and War.' That is appropriate. And it is just as original and just as good reading as any of the other chapters. Mrs. Stopes sees that Shakespeare knew about war, knew all there was to be known. How? Was he a soldier? When the Armada came 'he was in London twenty-four years old, unattached, patriotic, able-bodied, and the Commissioners of the counties had power to enrol all able-bodied men in the country.' But Mrs. Stopes does not believe that he became a soldier. It was the sea that called him, and it 'called him with a thousand voices. It was a late and wonderful revelation to him, with all its tender mysteries, its passionate energies, its dreams and its dreads, its shinings and gloomings, its infinite yearnings that seemed to draw out the hearts of the imaginative to itself, its crashing rebuffs, when it seemed driven to chaos, the type of the wild, free human soul.'

And he had a friend in the navy, William Harvey, the same who slew the Spanish Knight Don Hugo de Monçada. Now William Harvey was the W. H. of the Sonnets. Mrs. Stopes has proved it to her own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of Dr. Furnivall and Dr. Brandl.

Mr. Lynn Harold Hough has a fine gift of emotional writing. He would have every young man and every young woman choose well, the choice being endless. And he writes four sketches telling how three men and one woman made their choice. The title is *In the Valley of Decision* (Abingdon Press; 50 cents net).

In his volume on *Paul and his Epistles* (Methodist Book Concern; \$2 net), Professor D. A. Hayes of the Garrett Biblical Institute lays special emphasis on the circumstances under which each of the epistles was written. He describes with considerable vigour of modern language the situation in Rome, Corinth, and elsewhere. At Corinth 'there was great variety in the services. One might begin with great quiet and decorum and close like a cyclone of insanity. One might begin with an invective against all schismatics and

heretics who did not believe exactly what the speaker believed, and everybody might get more or less on edge as he listened. Then some one might be guided graciously to speak with such edification that all spirits were soothed and uplifted until they felt that they sat in the very court of heaven. There always was something doing in these services. No wonder that people were attracted to them and came and came again. There were some things which were disheartening and disgusting; but there were other things which were very heartening and interesting and convincing. People really were converted in these meetings. A church of God was being raised up in them.'

Besides helping us to realize the situation, Dr. Hayes introduces us to the epistles themselves. He gives a general description of each epistle, answers any questions that are still worth asking about its origin, date, style, and the rest; and then carries us swiftly through it that we may know what it is all about. This is all done competently and in close touch with the best believing scholarship.

It is a good introduction; not to be altogether neglected by the scholar; and to be much enjoyed by the reader.

The Rev. Francis Wood is greatly distressed on account of the suffering that there is in the world. In a book with the title of *Suffering and Wrong* (Bell; 4s. 6d. net) he describes vividly the Suffering of Inebriety, the Suffering of Female Degradation and Subjection, the Suffering of War, the Suffering of Poverty, the Suffering of the Prison System, and the Suffering of Flesh-eating. And he finds nothing in Christianity with which to meet the suffering, to mitigate, or put an end to it. 'We find,' he says, 'that Christianity rather hinders than helps us.' So he wants a new religion. He wants 'something deeper, diviner than Christianity; something out of which Christianity itself, and all forms of faith preceding it, in turn came.' The movements in favour of this new religion 'come out of the deep heart of humanity. They come from that spiritual nature of man which is the very dwelling-place of God, the very shrine of the holiest. They are the outcome of that inward energy of aspiration (surely it is also inspiration) which, in the long history of the world, has again and again quickened and uplifted the life of mankind, and which, in these latest days, is

once more blessing us with new aims, new hopes, and new ideals—in short, with a new religion.'

For those of us who have no time to go in for the study of physical science, and yet must know enough of evolution to speak or write truthfully, there is no better book than *The First Principles of Evolution*, by Dr. S. Herbert. The book was first published in 1913. A second and revised edition has been issued (A. & C. Black ; 7s. 6d. net). Its value lies in three directions. First, it covers the whole ground. Its three sections are Inorganic Evolution, Organic Evolution, and Superorganic Evolution. Under Superorganic Evolution there falls the whole subject of Social Evolution, the Family, the State, Religion. Secondly, it takes no previous knowledge of the subject for granted. All is intelligible to the beginner, even such ordinary words as polygamy and polygyny being explained in a glossary at the end. And, thirdly, it is illustrated throughout ; art and science go hand in hand to bring perfection.

A translation of the first book of *The Argonautica of Gaius Valerius Flaccus* has been made by Mr. H. G. Blomfield, M.A., late scholar of Exeter College, Oxford (Blackwell ; 3s. 6d. net). The volume contains an excellent short introduction and excellent long notes. Who reads Valerius Flaccus ? Not a few will read him now.

It has to be said at once that in writing on *Syria as a Roman Province* (Blackwell ; 6s. net) Mr. E. S. Bouchier, M.A., has not written for the student of the New Testament. Yet the student of the New Testament will have to master the book. For no other book will give him so compact or so authoritative an account of the province of Syria. And it is just possible that Mr. Bouchier, as a 'pure classic,' will be of greater service to the New Testament student than if he had written directly for him, as directly as Sir William Ramsay would have done. It is all here ; it is all in admirable order ; it is all in touch with the latest epigraphic and papyric information.

Happening to open Mr. G. G. Coulton's *The Main Illusions of Pacifism* (Bowes ; 5s. net) at page 167 we got a surprise. For the sentence we there read was this : 'His position was nearly that of the now almost departed Calvinism, wherein faith

alone avails, and all our righteousness is but filthy rags.' But the rest of the book is not like that. Mr. Coulton's theology is weak, but his patriotism is strong. He evidently does not know where he is when he touches doctrine, even by way of illustration, but he is at home in diplomacy and war.

Mr. Coulton's book is mainly an answer to the arguments of Mr. Norman Angell. It is a vigorous answer, an onslaught, and though somewhat discursive it gets many keen thrusts home. Not Mr. Angell only but also all others who have not risen to Mr. Coulton's ideal of patriotism are castigated heartily, especially Mr. Bertrand Russell, Mr. Lowes Dickinson, and Professor Pigou. What rouses his resentment most of all in these men is not their possible pacifism but their assumption of superiority. They claim to be above the prejudices of fiery patriots like Mr. Coulton. And it is just possible that they are. What then ? Mr. Coulton does not like them more. Do they do more good ? It is easy enough to be free from prejudice if you are free from enthusiasm.

A short introduction to *The Old Testament : Its Writers and Their Messages* has been written by C. Arnold Healing, M.A. (Butcher ; 2s. net). It is wonderful, so often is this done, how rarely it is done ill. Mr. Healing has done it right well. And his publisher has made the book most attractive.

To those who want to keep up with the issue of Commentaries on the Bible from the Cambridge University Press, it will be well to say that in 1899 Professor W. E. Barnes published a volume on *The Books of Chronicles* in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, working on the Authorized Version. In the same series, but working on the Revised Version, Mr. W. A. L. Elmslie, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, has published a wholly distinct book, though in the same series and under the same title (4s. 6d. net). It is practically the supersession of Professor Barnes's book. For it is right up to date and it reflects the editor's individuality. There is a discussion of every question raised by this difficult portion of the Old Testament, and an unwearied elucidation of every phrase in the text that has not its meaning written on the face of it. The maps also seem to have been brought up to date.

The Rev. John Muir, B.D., minister of the High

Parish, Paisley, has published a volume of sermons on *War and Christian Duty* (Paisley: Gardner; 2s. 6d. net) which will increase his reputation as a preacher and be to us an encouragement to faith in God. There is no scolding, but there is clear penitential recognition of faults and follies—the fault of hatred, for example, and the folly of reprisal. There is no contempt of the enemy, but there is a serious recognition of the tremendous responsibility laid upon us.

The Rev. Ernest F. H. Capey, believing that there is a call from the pew for a greater share in the exercises of public worship, has prepared a volume of Responsive Services, Sentences, and Prayers, which he has published under the title of *Sanctuary Worship* (Hooks). There is an edition in cloth and another in leather. Both are appropriate and attractive. And wherever the call is heard this book will have to be considered. Manifestly enough it has cost the author toil; but he has the desire and the gift, and the toil will be rewarded. The variety of response is remarkable, but just as remarkable is the never-failing sense of true worship.

Dr. W. J. Townsend is best known to outsiders for his share in the book entitled *A New History of Methodism* published in 1909. Inside his own Church he was best known as a 'leader of assemblies.' But his strength was not given to either sphere. He did not love the official life. 'While fervently grateful for the honours bestowed, I discovered whilst fulfilling the duties devolving on me that I had not the official frame of mind. The unrest and anxiety I experienced caused me worry which more than once caused a breakdown of my health. I have *some* happy reminiscences of my official life; but if I have to endure a reincarnation and the choice of a sphere of labour is left with me, I will say, "Ordinary church and circuit work for me; there is nothing like it." And so his biography is the biography of a pastor. It is good reading. Its title is *William John Townsend, D.D.* (Hooks; 1s. net). The author is the Rev. George Eayrs.

The Russian novelists are having their time in English. Dostoievsky is the favourite. But Dostoievsky leads back to Gogol. And *The Mantle and other Stories* by Nicholas Gogol, as translated into English by Mr. Claud Field (Werner Laurie),

is sure of a steady sale. It is certainly a strange life these Russian novelists look out upon, and strange is the philosophy they offer to explain it. Their failure to distinguish crime from misfortune is due partly to the indiscriminate mixture of political and criminal offenders in the Siberian prisons. More puzzling is the idea that sin can be effaced by suffering, which is so characteristic of all these Russian writers and so convincing to them all.

We are told that the patriot is most at home in the Old Testament. Even the militarist, we are told, finds his vindication in the books of Joshua and Judges. But what about the prophets? What about Habakkuk? The Rev. Geoffrey Gordon has gone to the prophet Habakkuk for an interpretation of this present war; and he has not found him a militarist. Rather has he found him a most severe judge of militarism. Mr. Gordon's volume of sermons is called *An Interpreter of War: Habakkuk* (Longmans; 1s. net).

It is most encouraging to find that the Atonement is taken as the central fact of Christianity by theologians of every school of theology. The Right Rev. Philip Mercer Rhinelander, D.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania, made *The Faith of the Cross* the topic of his Bishop Paddock Lectures in 1914, and now publishes them under that title (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). He recognizes his debt to Dr. P. T. Forsyth, and on the Atonement he is just as evangelical as that very evangelical theologian. He makes all Christianity gather round the Cross. 'The Faith of the Cross,' he says, 'is taken as equivalent to all we mean, or ought to mean, by Christianity.' There is good hope for the future in that.

We have just laid down Bishop Rhinelander's encouraging book to take up a volume of *Instructions on the Atonement* by the Rev. Paul B. Bull, M.A., Priest of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), and to find that the Atonement is again the centre round which all that belongs to Christianity is gathered. If Bishop Rhinelander recognized his debt to Dr. Forsyth, Mr. Bull acknowledges his obligation to Canon J. G. Simpson and to Principal Denney. He is more like Dr. Sparrow-Simpson, however (whose volume is noticed on another page), in making the

Atonement the centre only. He insists that we must not make it equivalent to Christianity. We must not forget, he says, that as we are reconciled by Christ's death, we are saved by His life. And so he takes the Incarnation as his starting-place and the Reunion of Christendom as his goal. Nevertheless it is his faith in the Atonement that gives him his book.

We are not to be allowed to forget Charles Haddon Spurgeon. It is not that his admirers have set up marble monuments to his memory here and there. Better memorial is the weekly, monthly, and yearly issue of his sermons ; and they go all over the world. The sixty-first yearly volume has been published. *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, revised and published during the year 1915 (Marshall Brothers), contains just as evangelical and just as arresting sermons as any volume issued while the great preacher was alive. For, unlike other preachers, Spurgeon had no off days.

The Viscountess Wolseley, 'citizen and gardener of London,' has found her sphere and she is happy in it. More than that, she has found a sphere for other women, who may be happy in it too, as happy as in any earthly occupation. For it is the occupation of gardening. She has founded a College of Gardening, and she has already trained many gardeners and sent them out to their life's work. This is her experience and her demand :

'Until quite recently, many looked down upon the profession of Gardencraft, for they imagined it to be a narrow life, restricted as regards its intellectual possibilities ; others considered that women were physically unsuited to it. As in all new professions, there were a certain number of failures at the outset, and these were due to a lack of perception on the part of employers, and partly to the fact that the right type of young woman did not take it up. After some sixteen years of buffettings and cold-shoulderings, a few brilliant examples of the right kind of women gardeners have worked their way up successfully through a small army of non-competents, and the craft is now an established and a coveted one for ladies. The employer, meanwhile, is slowly learning a lesson, and begins to realize that to have a lady as a gardener is a luxury, and must not be considered an economical way of reducing the payment of a living wage. A woman gardener, like all head

gardeners, should be paid in proportion to the amount of brain-fag, deception, and other disagreeables that, by honesty and intelligent supervision, she rescues her employer from being the victim of. Then, too, her practical, well-trained skill, her scientific education, deserve remuneration.'

The Viscountess Wolseley has already published books on gardening, for she can also write well. The latest book is *In a College Garden* (Murray ; 6s. net). Its text and its illustrations are both charming and business-like.

Although we have agreed to be patriots and neither Liberals nor Conservatives for a time, it is impossible for us to hide the colour of our ribbon completely. Dr. William Cunningham is a Conservative. Every page of his Lowell Lectures on *Christianity and Politics* (Murray ; 6s. net) declares it. On a few pages he is a Conservative before being a patriot. On page 189, for example, he quotes a long passage from a speech of Mr. Lloyd George. The speech was made at Cardiff in 1911 to Christian Ministers. He recommended his audience 'not to support particular parties, not to advocate particular measures of reform, but to create an atmosphere in which it will be impossible for anybody to remain a ruler of the realm unless he deals with those social problems.' Dr. Cunningham disapproves of that speech. He says it assigns such a meagre place to Christian influence that he is surprised it was received with enthusiasm. 'But it does not assign a meagre place to Christian influence. And certainly Mr. Lloyd George did not mean that 'the Church is only to be the handmaid of politicians.' If Dr. Cunningham is so dissatisfied with Mr. Lloyd George for saying what he did say, what would he have thought of him if he had recommended these Welsh ministers to be themselves active politicians ?

So this admirably phrased and instructive volume is the work of a convinced Conservative and will be accepted or rejected on that account. Few men have studied the relation between Christianity and Politics as Dr. Cunningham has done. Few men have his grasp of the principles which underlie that relation. Few have his gift of lucid exposition. He will not make converts. He is too decided in his views ; he is too decided in the expression of them. But he will confirm men of his own way of thinking that he and they are right together. We ourselves have not read anything more impres-

sive for some time than the pages which insist upon our responsibility to God as citizens, the direct demand God makes upon us to take our place in the service of the State.

The Hon. Bertrand Russell is a neutral. He thinks that Germany is more to blame for the war than Britain, but not much more. And he has republished a number of essays in which he declares his neutrality, calling the book *Justice in War Time* (Chicago: Open Court; \$1.00).

It is not easy for any one to be neutral at present. Loisy has chastised the Pope for his neutrality in a way to make all neutrals feel uncomfortable. That is one of the reasons why Mr. Russell is neutral. He enjoys minorities; he enjoys fighting; he enjoys war against war.

Most of the essays are quite ephemeral and might have been left in their magazines. The most serious is the last, which may not have appeared before. It is an elaborate attack upon the foreign policy of this country from 1904 to 1915. It is not an attack on Sir Edward Grey. He says: 'The criticism of British foreign policy which seems to us necessary is not a personal criticism of Sir Edward Grey: he has been merely the instrument, the man who carried on an ancient tradition. I cannot discover any matter, great or small, in which the policy of the Foreign Office was different under his administration and under Lord Lansdowne's. It is not the man, but the maxims which he has inherited, that must be criticised.'

We cannot answer it here of course. We can only say that we are not impressed by it. On the contrary it seems to indicate that Mr. Russell's neutrality is not always neutral. As he is answering Professor Gilbert Murray it was perhaps inevitable that he should ignore one set of circumstances and urge the other. But it weakens his claim of superiority to patriotic prejudice.

An addition to 'Every Christian's Library' is *How God Answers Prayer*, as set forth in the Narrative of some of the Lord's dealings with George Müller. The volume is compiled by A. E. C. Brookes (Pickering & Inglis).

A word to those newly confirmed has been spoken by the Rev. Harold M. Porter, and the little book containing it has been introduced to us by the

Bishop of Chelmsford. The title is *The Bishop's Prayer for you* (Scott; 6d. net).

Five discourses on *The Prodigal Son* have been first preached and then published by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D., Rector of St. Clements, Oxford (Scott). The first discourse is introductory: and in it the preacher utters a caution which is far more necessary than some other preachers think. He says: 'The parable teaches us of the mercy and love of God, but it does not give us the whole body of religion; there is no mention for instance of Our Lord, of the Holy Spirit, of the Atonement and many other such vital facts, and hence those who have taken their theology from this parable only, have very one-sided views of God. We must not take our views of God from this parable alone, we should not take our views of God even from one book of the Bible by itself; we get a very one-sided view of Christ, for example, if we read St. John's Gospel only, we need the view of the other three Gospels as well.'

The Bishop of Durham on the Seven Epistles has been the chief item of interest in the *Churchman* for some months. The articles are now issued in book form: *Some Thoughts on the Seven Epistles* (Scott; 2s. net). The expression 'Some thoughts' gives scope enough, but Dr. Moule's thoughts are all brought into captivity to the mind of Christ. He preaches the gospel of the grace of God. As certainly as St. Paul, he knows nothing among us save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Canon Edmund McClure has done good work in separating true Christianity from false. In his latest little book he shows that Spiritualism is not Christian—nor any other good thing. Its title is *Spiritualism: A Historical and Critical Sketch* (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net).

Out of the Forms of Intercession authorized and used on the 9th of March 1796, the 25th of May 1804, and the 20th of March 1811, a selection has been made and issued by the S.P.C.K. under the title of *War Prayers of One Hundred Years Ago* (3d. net).

The clergy of the Diocese of York assembled in the Minster of York on 14th and 15th February 1916. They were summoned by the Archbishop. Not

one single clergyman ignored the summons, 'and only one is absent for a reason which I cannot regard as a sufficient excuse.' The Charge then delivered has now been published. Its title is *The Church and the Clergy at this Time of War*, by Cosmo Gordon Lang, D.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of York (S.P.C.K. ; 1s. net). It consists of three short practical, well-pressed-home addresses on Repentance, Renewal, and Rebuilding.

The Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham, has issued a small volume of 'Thoughts for Stricken Hearts,' under the title of *Christ and Sorrow* (S.P.C.K. ; 1s. net). Near the end of the book he says: 'I have in my mind's eye a little Parable of Consolation. It consists of an old book-marker, once belonging to my dear mother, and very precious now to me her son. A text is worked on it, in blue silk on the pierced card. A few years ago I found it in a book, after having long lost sight of it. I saw first its "wrong side"; and that was just an unmeaning tangle of confused and crossing threads. Then I turned it round. On the "right side," in beautifully clear letters, *produced by the tangled stitches*, I read these three deep, glorious, eternal words, GOD IS LOVE.' The publishers have made a clever use of this thought. The paper just inside the cover at the beginning shows the wrong side of the book-marker, the paper at the end shows the right side.

The whole process of *Reconciliation between God and Man* has been described by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D., in a book which he has published with that title (S.P.C.K. ; 3s. net). Dr. Sparrow-Simpson begins with the Incarnation and ends with the Perpetual Offering of Christ. Between these, as the great operative fact, he places the Death of Christ. And he has no hesitation in saying that it is the Death, and not either the Incarnation or the Perpetual Offering, that is the central reconciling fact. But his object is to show that you ought not to isolate the act of Death and call it everything. If an Incarnate Christ who did not die would have served nothing for reconciliation, so also a dying Christ who was not pre-existent would have been of no avail.

We are glad that Dr. Sparrow-Simpson has used the word Reconciliation. It is a good word which has fallen out of favour. It has a definite and necessary place. Smaller than Salvation, it is larger than Atonement. The end is Peace, the means to the end is best expressed by Reconciliation.

In *The Glory of the Life Laid Down* (Stock ; 2s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. K. Swinburne, B.A., Vicar of Shifnal, has sent out some words of comfort for those in sorrow. The little book contains eight addresses, each address a proof that there is no consolation better than that which is found in the Word.

The Denials of Peter.

BY SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., LITT.D., D.D., EDINBURGH.

II. THE HIGH PRIEST ANNAS.

WHEN Jesus was brought into Jerusalem there was still a long time to pass before daylight began. This interval had to be spent somehow, and although the party which had arrested Jesus 'led him away to appear before Caiaphas as judge,'¹ they had to wait until the hour when Caiaphas could take his seat in the High Council for this purpose. John explains the whole situation: 'they seized Jesus and bound him, and led him to be judged by Annas in the first place'—implying that there was in their mind a further destination,

and so not disagreeing with Matthew, who says, 'they led Jesus away to be tried before Caiaphas.'

Matthew refers to the proper and official trial before the High Council with Caiaphas presiding. The informal investigation before Annas was lost from the common tradition.

In the Revised Version that critical verse of Mt 26⁵⁷ is translated, 'they led him away to the house of Caiaphas.' This is impossible, for in Greek the preposition *πρός* with the accusative of a personal name cannot mean 'to the house of that person'; but it is technical and idiomatic in the sense of 'to appear before a person as judge in a court of justice,' and this is what is meant in this

¹ Mt 26⁵⁷.

place.¹ Dr. Moffatt, in his 'New Translation,' follows the error of the Revisers, although the Authorized Version is right.

The practically universal opinion among scholars, however, is that there is at this point a difference between John and the three Synoptic Gospels; and that the latter unanimously describe Jesus as having been led to the house of Caiaphas. Yet John was an acquaintance of the high priest, and must have known the exact situation.

Doubt, however, has been expressed by Westcott and others whether the scene of the first investigation and of Peter's denials occurred in the house of Annas or in that of Caiaphas, and reasons are set forth in order to prove that there is doubt, and that perhaps John may be understood in the same sense as Mark. I can see no reasonable ground for doubt. Take the statements in order: (1) In John 18¹⁸ Jesus is led away to appear before Annas in the first place; this implies a first investigation, unofficial (because Caiaphas, not Annas, is the official high priest), preliminary to the proper trial before the Council, where Caiaphas would preside.

(2) Then follow the two scenes in question (18¹⁵⁻²⁸), in the house of a person who bears the title of high priest (the reason for which is explained by Luke 3² and Acts 4⁶).

(3) After this preliminary investigation, 'Annas therefore sent Jesus, bound as he was, to appear before Caiaphas' (15²⁴). As the result of the trial in his own house, Annas sends the prisoner to Caiaphas for the proper official trial. Then follows the official trial before the Council (which John does not describe, for a reason that will be stated after examination of the circumstances).

(4) After this scene 'they lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas to the official quarters of the Roman governor' (whose confirmation of the Council's capital sentence was needed before it could become effective) (18²⁸).

It seems positively irrational to take John to mean that Caiaphas presided both in stage (2) and stage (3), and that, after starting to take Jesus to Annas, they delivered Him before Caiaphas for some unstated reason, and that then Annas reappears and sends Jesus to Caiaphas, when Caiaphas

¹ In Ac 11⁸ the meaning 'into the house of' is admitted by some (e.g. Souter's new and excellent *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek N.T.*, though he tacitly rejects it in Mt 26⁵⁷): the meaning there is 'into the society of.'

had just been presiding at the trial of His case. The sole reason for mentioning that Jesus was conducted in the first place before Annas is that He was so conducted, and that Annas then sent Him to be officially judged by Caiaphas [in the second place]. So John says; and, in the face of Luke 3², arguments about the applicability of the title high priest to Annas are beside the mark.

It is clear that Annas had been taking a keen interest in this matter, and with his servants had been engaged in arresting Jesus. He was one of the leading figures in the party of the Sadducees, and his dignity was consulted by leading Jesus before him and holding a sort of preliminary examination which was not official, but in which the feelings and the hatred and even the curiosity of the opponents of Jesus found scope. Those who joined in the arrest were now waiting in the house of the high priest (Mt 26⁵⁷). Mk 14⁵⁸ says that the chief priests and the elders and the scribes entered the house along with him. The statement seems strange in Mark's narrative; but it becomes natural when we remember Luke's assertion that they had been present at the arrest. They it was to whom the Tribune gave the prisoner in charge.

It is clear that in all the four-narratives there occurred two examinations before bodies of Jews. The second of these is described very briefly in Mt 27¹, Mk 15¹, and at greater length in Lk 22⁶⁶⁻⁷¹. That these three passages refer to the same proceedings is clearly marked by the time. Each of the three writers mentions that the action occurred about sunrise. This must be the formal meeting of the Sanhedrim which was held officially to examine the accused and to decide whether or not He should be sent up for trial before the Roman Governor, and, if so, upon what charge the trial should be made. That this is the proper time for a meeting of the High Council is established, if I may quote in evidence a statement which I cannot verify: 'according to the report of Jose Ben Chalaftha it held its sittings from the time of the offering of the daily morning sacrifice.'

The preliminary examination before Annas was, therefore, in keeping with the outrages in the proceedings generally. We may suppose that, when Annas (Jn 18-19) asked Jesus about His disciples and His teaching, he may have been actuated by curiosity and so put an unofficial question, but he had no right to examine the prisoner officially, and the action of an officer in

striking the prisoner in his house had no justification. Annas held no official position before the law: he was only a private citizen who possessed great influence and dignity because he had formerly been high priest, and was considered by his own people to have been unjustly and illegally removed from that position. In his own household he was still spoken of as 'the high priest' (Jn 18¹⁰), and probably this courtesy was generally accorded to him in the city;¹ but it gave no legal power; there could not be two high priests, and Caiaphas his son-in-law was the high priest in law and fact. Yet this informal and really illegal trial before Annas was, in a sense, 'a preliminary trial,' as John expressly says.

It is, however, evident that the memory of Annas was lost in the popular tradition of the Jerusalem congregation, and that 'the high priest' was generally understood to be Caiaphas, when any name was given to him in the story as usually told in the Jewish Christian families there. Mark, who gives the congregational tradition in its most simple and unadorned fashion,² never mentions Caiaphas, but speaks simply of the high priest. Matthew mentions him twice by name, and in a different connexion (26³) speaks of 'the courtyard of Caiaphas the high priest.' There can therefore be little doubt that they both thought of Caiaphas in connexion with the trial of Jesus. Luke, however, had the instinct of the historian and the Greek for fact and exact truth; and he discovered and recorded that there were two high priests at this time, 'of whom he always mentions Annas first (Lk 3², Ac 4⁶); in one case he speaks of 'Annas the high priest and Caiaphas,' but he never names Caiaphas alone as high priest. It is therefore quite fair to interpret him as asserting that Jesus 'was brought into the house of the high priest' Annas, thus confirming expressly the statement of John. Those who consider, as I do, that Luke's history is composed with extraordinary care for the minute details which in different parts of his narrative work into one another, will be disposed to conjecture that there is good reason why he mentions two high priests in 3², and that in some other part of his narrative, viz. here, the

¹ This general custom leads Lk 3² to say, in his brief style, that the high priests at this time were Annas and Caiaphas.

² That Mark gives here, not the direct narrative of Peter (as Papias and others say about his Gospel), but the common tradition in the earliest Church at Jerusalem, will become more and more clear as the investigation proceeds. I do not assert that this is universal, only that it appears to be so in this episode.

term high priest should be understood accordingly. That this is his meaning will be shown later.

The official meeting of the Council is also alluded to by John in a few words (vv. 24, 38). Before this official meeting it is agreed by all the evangelists that another gathering had occurred in the house of the high priest, and that this gathering finished at cock-crow; while it was going on the denials of Peter were taking place at intervals in the courtyard outside that meeting.

I would go so far as to maintain that there is no authority for supposing that Jesus was ever in the house of Caiaphas that morning. He was led from the house of Annas to the hall where the Council met, wherever that was. But the case for Caiaphas has been so universally accepted that it must be examined further.

To us it would appear strange that a judge shortly before the trial at which he was to preside began, should bring into his house and hold conversation with a person whom he was about to try on a criminal charge, and on whom he was to allow physical outrage to be inflicted. Such conduct on the part of a judge would be condemned as unbecoming and wrong. I once was witness of such a situation in Scotland, where one party in a case was by mischance introduced to the judge who was to preside half an hour before the case was fixed to begin. The judge broke off the conversation the moment that he heard the name, and afterwards he said that it was the most awkward thing which had happened to him in his whole legal experience.

If such be the feeling among us, a feeling obviously founded on right perception of justice and equity, why should we think that the Jews were devoid of such perception of natural fairness? Why should we take it as a matter of course that the president of the supreme Jewish court would allow an accused person to be brought to his house in the night, and would see and converse with him, and look on while the accused was actually struck in the face? If this were recorded, we should have to accept the fact; but, when there is no clear record and a clear contradiction of it, we may set it aside. Annas indeed did it; but evidently he was playing fast and loose with his authority as titular high priest. This was a trial that was held in his house, and yet it was not a trial, according to circumstances.

Further examination of the circumstances shows positively that John is correct, and that Luke

positively confirms him, and that a series of false statements about Jewish custom have been invented and circulated in order to explain how that which never happened did happen. The false statements probably made their appearance at first as hypotheses to account for a supposed but strange fact. Then they were repeated, because they are found in the pages of great scholars, and the hypothetical character was forgotten, and they masquerade as truth. Thus, for example, it is often said that the high priest had an official residence in the Temple enclosure, that the High Council met in his house, and that Annas lived with his son-in-law Caiaphas. Another statement is that Annas and Caiaphas lived in houses adjoining each other, with a common courtyard. These are in origin mere hypotheses concocted to explain why John speaks of the house of Annas here; but they have no foundation, and most of them are demonstrably impossible. Yet from hypotheses they have passed into the learning of the schools, and are laid down as facts in some meritorious and otherwise useful books. I quote one example of the conveyance of these false hypotheses, and the dissemination of mere conjecture as fact: 'The High Priest's house: this was in the Temple enclosure, where, according to Jn 18¹²⁻²⁴, Annas lived with his son-in-law Caiaphas.' Such transference of errors from book to book is a fruitful source of further error: the next stage is to resort to 'emendation' of the text, or to transposition of the parts, or to rejection of some verses, in order to cure the ills that have been introduced into the Gospels by our own false interpretation of them.

Again, if Annas had no part in the action, it may be asked how John came to make such an error as to bring him into it. No explanation is obvious. On the other hand it is easy to see why his part in the action, if he had any, might have been forgotten or ignored as being unofficial.

It is apparent that either Mark and Matthew have mixed up the meeting of the Council with the assemblage 'in the house of the high priest,' or (as is more probable, confirming John's expression *πρὸς Ἀνναν*, 'to be judged by Annas') the proceedings in the house of Annas were modelled on the procedure of the Sanhedrim. The trial, which was finished by cock-crow, could not possibly be a meeting of the Sanhedrim, which did not sit before sunrise: yet both Mark and Matthew speak of it as 'the chief priests and the whole

council,' and describe the calling of witnesses, and how 'they all condemned him to be worthy of death.' These same writers, however, describe how the Council met to discuss the case at sunrise, agreeing in this with Luke and John. The proceedings at this proper meeting of the Council are not reported by any one except Luke. John does not report it for a reason which will be stated in a later section. Matthew and Mark did not do so, because they had already given a report of similar proceedings as occurring elsewhere before cock-crow.

The belief that Jesus was conducted to the house of Caiaphas then rests on a mistranslation of Matthew and a misinterpretation of Luke, while it flatly contradicts John; yet it apparently must be regarded as belonging to the common tradition in the early Jerusalem Church, until it was expressly corrected by John. Luke avoided falling into it, but did not expressly contradict it. He describes the proceedings of the Jewish Council, where Jesus was condemned, as occurring at sunrise; and he reports nothing about the action 'in the house of the high priest before cock-crow,' except that Jesus was ill-treated there,¹ and that afterwards He was led to the High Council when day was come.

We can now arrange with the highest confidence the exact sequence and almost the hours of the action. Jesus was arrested in the early morning, say about 2 o'clock. He reached the house of Annas before 4 o'clock. Some or many of those who had made the arrest were servants of Annas; and in this house, as being for some reason more convenient, Jesus was detained for about an hour (Luke gives the estimate of time). By that time the hour of meeting of the Council was at hand, and Caiaphas was ready to take his seat as president. Jesus was led to the Council Hall, and there began the trial which is described in Mt 27¹, Mk 15¹, and more fully in Lk 22⁶³⁻⁷¹: this scene is entirely omitted by John, though its occurrence is clearly indicated in 18²⁴ and 18²⁸. Thence He was led to the Praetorium of the Procurator Pilate about 7 A.M. The trial with the incidents accompanying it lasted till about 12 noon. Then He was taken away to be crucified outside the city. The Synoptists' statement of time (Mt 27⁴⁵, Mk 15³³, Lk 23⁴⁴) must be taken as a vague estimate current in the tradition, whereas John is accurate, as was said above.

¹ I assume that Lk 22⁶³⁻⁶⁵ describes this scene in the house of Annas.

The Mystery of the Kingdom.

BY THE REV. J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.PHIL.

WHEN we pray, 'Thy kingdom come,' we think of the gradual approach of some 'final reign of right,' some consummation to be progressively realized in the indefinitely distant future. When the original followers of the Lord repeated that petition, they and He thought of an immediately-impending, catastrophic event, the resumption by YHVH of His Kingship over Israel, and so over the whole earth. It was the *nearness* of that event which the Baptist and Jesus alike proclaimed, and it was the sounding of *this* note which accounted for the immense stir their preaching created. The coming of the Kingdom was not conceived as an evolutionary process culminating in a 'crowning age of ages,' but as a sudden and wholly supernatural change which God would bring in suddenly and once for all, a change heralded by tremendous upheavals in the realm of nature (Jl 2^{30, 31}; cp. Mk 13^{24, 25}). It requires a very great effort on our part to enter into that conception, so remote from ours; and a still greater to accustom ourselves to the thought that this, and not ours, was our Lord's conception. Yet unless we make that effort, a phrase like 'the mystery of the Kingdom' will perforce remain unintelligible to us.

I.

From the days of the Captivity onwards, a markedly pessimistic tinge is found to colour Jewish thought and literature—a feeling which might be described as God-forsakenness, the result of the people's sins. Israel was under a shadow, YHVH had withdrawn His presence and favour from His disobedient nation, leaving it to its adversaries to oppress; through the influence of Persian dualism the present evil age came to be thought of as under the dominion of ungodly powers—Satan came to figure as 'the prince of this world.' One hope lighted up this darkness, namely, that in the fulness of time, when Israel should have expiated its transgressions, YHVH would once more ascend the throne He had temporarily abandoned, scattering His people's enemies, and restoring their independence under His own sway and sceptre. Thus the great prophet of the Exile prays: 'Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation

of thy holiness and of thy glory: where is thy zeal and thy mighty acts? . . . Return for thy servants' sake. . . . We are become as they over whom thou never barest rule' (Is 63¹⁵⁻¹⁹ *pass.*). Thus, too, in the days of our Lord, every pious Jew petitioned daily: 'Bring back our judges as of old, and our counsellors as from the beginning; cause sorrow and sighing to flee away from us, and be thou king over us, even thou alone, O YHVH.'

To promise a far-distant fulfilment of such instant prayers would have aroused little enthusiasm; what drew the multitudes to Jesus was the assurance He breathed that the Kingdom—the victory of God and the overthrow of Satan; which His hearers would interpret as the casting-off of the Roman yoke and the redemption of Israel—was at the very doors. We do not confound the eschatological form in which His message was proclaimed with the substance of that message; but it has to be recognized that as regards the outward shape and colour of His expectations Jesus was in close accord with the ideas current around Him. Unquestionably He looked for the new era in the immediate future; there is no doubting the authenticity or mistaking the force of His confident prediction to the *disciples*, 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come' (Mt 10²³), and the same applies to the promise, 'There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God' (Lk 9²⁷; cp. Mk 9¹, Mt 16²⁸; also Mk 13³⁰, Mt 24³⁴, Lk 21³²). Even at His trial He told His judges, 'Henceforth'—i.e. presently—'ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven' (Mt 26⁶⁴), which, of course, meant the imminent advent of the Kingdom. It is equally true that He depicted the blessedness to be enjoyed by the partakers in that consummation in perfectly realistic fashion; that He promised tangible, hundredfold reward to those who had made sacrifices for the Gospel's sake (Mk 10³⁰, Mt 19²⁹); that He told His disciples they should eat and drink at His table in His kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel

(Lk 22⁸, Mt 19²⁸); and that He Himself looked forward to drinking the fruit of the vine in the Kingdom of God (Mk 14²⁵). When we add the reminder that He considered His mission to be exclusively to His nation, it will be seen how far He shared the outlook of His age and race.

On the other hand, two facts are to be noted: that, while formally Jesus looked for a Kingdom of God which should be an idealized Jewish theocracy, He has not one word to say on that favourite theme of His co-religionists, the Divine vengeance to be exacted on the heathen; and that in His thought admission to the Kingdom is to be gained, not in virtue of membership of the Jewish race, but on condition of the fulfilment of certain extremely high ethical demands. If the mould into which He poured His thought was inevitably eschatological, the precious metal that flowed into the mould was ethical and spiritual: those who are approved in the Judgment, the heirs of the Kingdom, are those who have practised kindness and brotherly love towards the needy and afflicted, without national or racial qualification.

And in yet another respect we see Him as One who had already outgrown the limitations of the current conception of the Kingdom; for whereas that conception was purely futurist, Jesus is conscious as it were by flashes that the new order has already begun, is already 'in the midst' (Lk 17^{20, 21}), while men are still waiting for its manifestation with pomp and circumstance. It is true that He accounted for that consciousness by pointing to His success in casting out demons; but the inner assurance was there in the first place, and the explanation came later. He felt that His personality was introducing a new factor into the world, which was no longer the same now that He had come. The Baptist He saw, for all his greatness, as still quite definitely belonging to the old order of things, which was passing away, whereas He Himself marked a fresh epoch, the daybreak of God's righteous reign. That glimpse was none the less true for being occasional and intermittent; in a manner past explaining, nor needing explanation, He knew that by the fact of His coming the threshold was already crossed, the new Dispensation begun.

II.

So much by way of barest orientation. We now turn to the subject indicated in our title, the

question raised by the words, 'Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God,' addressed by the Lord to the inner circle of His disciples (Mk 4¹¹; cp. Mt 13¹¹, Lk 8¹⁰). What is this mystery, the knowledge of which, we are given to understand, is confined to a small knot of intimates, but withheld from the great multitude?

The mere imminence of the Kingdom was, of course, no secret, but rather the key-note of both the Baptist's and our Lord's preaching. We hold, with Schweitzer, that the secret is to be sought in the explanation *why* the crisis was approaching just then, and, possibly, in an indication of *how close* it was thought to be; and that both explanation and indication are contained in certain parables, the inner meaning of which the habitual associates of Jesus might be expected to penetrate, while the multitudes could apprehend it only dimly, if at all. Mark, followed by Matthew, relates a tradition, doubtless authentic, according to which Jesus on a certain day taught the crowd by the lake-shore 'many things in parables' (4²), and in connexion with that day's teaching he records the saying, spoken to the disciples, 'Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without all things are done in parables.' Not all the parables related in this chapter are equally concerned with this 'mystery'; the Evangelist gives us neither all those nor only those which were uttered on that occasion, the fact being that even in his day the 'mystery' was no longer understood—as how could it be, seeing that it referred to the extreme nearness of an event which had not come to pass forty years later?

The principal parables setting forth the mystery of the Kingdom are those of the Sower, the Seed growing secretly, the Mustard-seed, and the Leaven; the latter is given in Mt 13³⁸ as following the Parable of the Mustard-seed, to which it forms a companion picture, as that of the Seed growing secretly does to that of the Sower. If we can find one strand of thought running through them, or find them linked in an unforced manner by one principle, the mystery will grow clearer. We leave on one side, with a good conscience, the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mk 4¹⁸⁻²⁰), which represents the thought, not of the Lord, but of another, later mind, replacing originality by ingenuity.

What these four parables exhibit uniformly is the contrast between small causes and great effects; a hidden process set in motion by seemingly inade-

quate means, and the inevitable and disproportionately large results which supervene; in the first three the emphasis lies on seed-time and harvest, the day of small things and the season of surprising issues. In that spring-time the Word is being sown, the momentous process is being initiated, which will bring in the Kingdom with the same inevitableness, and presumably the same speed, with which the sowing of the grain leads on the harvest, which is elsewhere (Mt 13³⁹) used as signifying the consummation of the age. The generality of hearers, 'they that are without,' know only that Jesus is *announcing* the Kingdom; but those who are familiar with His mind are aware that He is Himself *bringing* it, *compelling its advent*—that is the mystery. As the farmer's sowing of the seed compels the earth to respond with her harvest of ripening corn, so the sowing of the Word, though much of the seed may come to nothing, will compel the heavenly harvest to ripen—invisibly, mysteriously, irresistibly—and the Kingdom to appear, just about the time when the reapers on earth put forth their sickles. Some of the seed is sure to fall on good ground, and will bring forth abundantly; and once it is sown, the end is assured, and the sower may go home, sleep and rise, rise and sleep, for without further co-operation on his part the seed is growing in the dark soil, sending up first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. The sower 'knoweth not how' the growth proceeds, but that is immaterial, since the result is pre-ordained. Man's part seems exiguous in proportion to earth's mysteriously large response; the little leaven mysteriously pervades and alters the nature of the whole lump; the little grain of mustard-seed mysteriously grows into a shrub ten feet high; the little movement now in progress must issue in the Kingdom of God—*there is the mystery.*

III.

But how could Jesus connect, and so intimately connect, His preaching with the coming Kingdom? And if He did so, was He not, in consequence of His eschatological prepossessions, the victim of a tragic delusion, since the Kingdom certainly did not come as and when He expected it? Such a conclusion, though it might be impatiently put forward, would only amount to ignoring the golden treasure of His thought because of the eschatological earthen vessel containing it.

For the all-important element in the thought of Jesus was not that the new era was quite close at hand, but that it was to be brought in by the sowing of the Word, quickening human effort, and effort of a certain kind—palpably inadequate as such an instrument might seem to accomplish such a result. It is a total mistake to point to the Parable of the Seed growing secretly as showing that in His view man could only wait passively for the Kingdom, as the farmer did for the corn; on the contrary, the farmer, by his seemingly insignificant act, as we have seen, *made* the earth yield her increase, compelled the corn to rise from the ground. Jesus was not at all a passive character; that He declined the futility of armed insurrection must not make us think of Him as averse to the most strenuous exertion which He thought would bring in the Kingdom.

What kind of exertion could this be? We find the answer in Mt 11¹², where He declares that 'from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force.' This, in accordance with the conventional conception of our Saviour as a calm, serene sage, has been taken to express a rebuke to those ardent spirits who would not wait, but meant to realize their aspirations by a supreme effort: in truth it expressed the very opposite of a rebuke, which the words do not so much as imply, and it would be truer to say that even if Jesus did not approve of all the methods of these men, He warmly sympathized with their strenuous, activist disposition. The Kingdom of God was to be forced on, pressure was to be brought to bear which would compass the great end—and this process had been going on from the days of John the Baptist, i.e., for a year or two. What did this process consist in? In a passionate return to God—that is the meaning of the term rendered in our Gospels by *μετάνοια*, 'repentance'—and a moral renewal. It was this which the Baptist had preached (Lk 3⁸⁻¹⁴), this, we may surmise, which had drawn Jesus so mightily to him. Repentance, and fruits worthy of repentance, were to compel the Kingdom to appear.

This idea is not unrelated to, yet sharply differentiated from, what was held by the professedly religious of the day. The Kingdom lingered because the people were sinful. To the Pharisee this meant that the Law was not observed with anything like sufficient strictness; it was a saying

recorded in the Talmud that Israel would be redeemed if the nation would keep only two Sabbaths as the Sabbath should be kept. That, of course, was a mere caricature of the prophets' view that Israel was out of favour with YHVH because of its disobedience and backsliding, but that YHVH would return to His people when they sanctified themselves, and turned to Him; and this prophetic conviction Jesus instinctively adopts. This is the point where His ethical enthusiasm coalesces with, and transforms, His eschatological hopes: He preaches the nearness of the Kingdom, but preaches it as a consummation to be realized by a resolute moral regeneration, a vehement, passionate willingness to surrender all, sacrifice all, and so to achieve that worthiness of the Kingdom upon which the Kingdom itself will follow with the same inevitableness as harvest follows seed-time. That explains the touch of 'violence' which meets us in so many of His demands, the absolutism of His moral code, which admits of no qualifying circumstances: only 'by force,' by the utmost moral energy, is the Kingdom to be taken—and how immeasurably does the prize transcend in worth our highest effort to attain it, as the pearl of great price is far more valuable than all the merchant pays for it, though what he pays is his all!

That, then, is the grandiose conception of Jesus, His plan to call the Kingdom into being, quickly, immediately, with power; not by a quietism, waiting with folded hands, but by a heroic ethic, ready for the Cross, by the most implicit obedience to God's will, was the Golden Age to be brought in. It is open to us to see the essential truth of this conception, and its independence of those mere garments of eschatology which speedily dropped from it. We mean that the Kingdom, the Sovereignty, of God can always be realized by the individual soul which acknowledges and obeys Him as its Sovereign; while every one who seeks with sincerity to do His blessed Will is conscious of working for the advent of His Kingdom on earth. That that consummation did not appear when Jesus expected it, is a detail; that it can and will come only *in the way* He expected it, matters everything. Not in one glorious burst, but little by little, not catastrophically but evolutionally, will the more perfect human society, with God as its Blessed and Only Potentate, be established; but the method is that proclaimed and enjoined

by Jesus Christ—moral regeneration, rightness of motive prompting rightness of conduct.

IV.

But did our Lord really anticipate such a return and renewal to be effected on the part of all and sundry, and that so rapidly that the grand climax would be reached by the time of approaching harvest? He entertained no such extravagant anticipations; for here we touch the very centre of the mystery of the Kingdom.

Let us remember that it is the relatively small proportion of the seed falling on the good ground which produces the abundant harvest; it is the little leaven that leaveneth the whole lump; it is the little grain of mustard-seed which grows into so imposing a plant—or, according to an ingenious conjecture of the original meaning of the parable, which by its pungency alters the whole flavour of the dish; and it was the small number of men of violence—let us substitute 'passion'—the spiritual élite intent upon the one aim, whose efforts would 'take the Kingdom by force': there was the mystery.

This idea, too—the salvation of all Israel, not by its own merits, but by the availing merits of a pious and God-pleasing remnant—is a reminiscence from Isaiah (1⁹); and the prophet, in turn, shows that he is inspired by the ancient and beautiful story of Abraham's pleading with YHVH, and how the cities of the Plain might have been saved from the destruction they deserved, had there been but ten righteous persons in them. In the same way Jesus, though He is leagues removed from the bitter contempt of the Pharisees for the common people—cp. Jn 7⁴⁹, 'This multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed'—feels almost from the outset that the success of His movement, *i.e.*, the coming of the Kingdom, is not dependent upon the acceptance of His message by the masses: that aim will be attained *for all* by the consecrated efforts of *a few*, the vehement lovers of God and His righteousness—which is a mystery indeed.

And here once more we see all history vindicating the spiritual intuition of our Lord. If the world is getting better, not, indeed, from generation to generation, but in the long sweep of the centuries—if an abuse is abolished here, and a hoary evil improved out of existence there—the result is

due, not to the great mass of careless humanity, but to the chosen band, few in number, yet invincible in purpose, who are consumed by their zeal for the Lord's house, the leaven which leavens our dulness and indifference; to the men and women whose heart is so inflamed by the wrong that round them lies, by the vision of the good to be won, that they are determined to perish themselves if that is the only way by which the Kingdom can be brought nearer. And at the head of these stands the Great Chief of faithful souls, 'the holiest among the mighty, and the mightiest among the holy,' who for the joy that was set before Him—to win the Kingdom for mankind—endured the Cross, despising shame. It is the supreme sacrifices of supreme souls which abound unto the salvation of the world, and prove 'a ransom for many' who are not even

conscious of what has been done and suffered for them.

In anticipating the advent of the Kingdom in the imminent future, whether within the year or within the lifetime of His generation, Jesus was the child of His age; in pointing to the method and agency by which alone the goal would be won, He declared a central mystery which is also a vital truth, and which every age and every soul may verify anew. When the love of goodness becomes a passion—not an academic approbation, but a dynamic violently struggling into life—then, and not till then, redemption draweth nigh, and the Kingdom is 'in the midst.'

The Mystery of the Kingdom is sealed and unsealed with a Cross.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

May.

EMPIRE DAY.

'With a great sum obtained I this freedom.'—Acts 22²⁸.

MANY years ago, a little girl got a letter on her birthday. It was written on very fine paper with a grand crest at the top. If you were to see any of your little girl friends look as demure and old-fashioned as this child did when the letter was read to her, I believe you would feel half sorry, and wonder if she ever played. That little girl's letter of long ago came at length to be printed in a book, and this morning I want to let you hear the first sentence of it.

24th May 1822.

'Uncle William and Aunt Adelaide send their love to *dear little Victoria*, with their best wishes on her birthday, and hope that she will now become a *very good girl*, being now *three years old*.'

Little Victoria afterwards became our Queen, and a very good Queen she was. She lived to be an old woman, having reigned more than sixty years.

During her reign her birthday was always kept. Those of your fathers and mothers who had their

early homes in a city will remember how, on the 24th of May, or as near that date as possible, they used to get a school holiday—The Queen's Birthday. When King Edward became king he made no change; the old holiday remained, and in Victoria's memory was called 'Victoria Day.'

1. To you the 24th of May is known by the bigger name of 'Empire Day.' I wonder if you ever ask yourselves what that name means? You run about and enjoy yourselves; you take all the fun you can out of your holiday, for it is generally a day of bright sunshine. The name probably conveys as little meaning to you as 'Whitsunday' does. Yet there is a long and wonderful story behind the word 'Empire.'

When Trafalgar Day is mentioned, what big boy or girl does not think of Nelson and his famous battle-cry—'England expects every man to do his duty'? On Empire Day we are meant to be happy and proud because we belong to the British Empire. At school, I feel sure that you have been told how the sun never sets on it. That is just a poetical way of saying that it includes countries all round the Globe—Australia, New Zealand, India, part of Africa, Canada. But it is possible that not so much of its wonderful story has been told you as might have been.

2. That story is only in the making. Your

fathers and mothers know how interesting it has been in the past; one day you boys and girls will be able to thank God for its grandeur. For nearly two years our Empire has been armed and up to fight. We are fighting for freedom, and that against a nation whose religion, instead of being the *Love* taught by Jesus Christ, is a religion of *Might*. Since the terrible struggle began, we have learnt among many other things that our peoples all over the world are bound together by a tie like that of the family. In Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, young men have risen up and said, 'I am going to help'—'Home to help,' they say: they never forget that this Island of Great Britain is the mother country, and they love it.

Every one of us is longing for the struggle to cease. The losses to the Empire have been counted by hundreds of thousands of precious lives. The war has cost a very great deal of money too. But if the Empire remains true to the traditions and ideals of this our Island home, one day her children will be able to thank God, even while they remember the terrible sorrow and loss. Through these very sorrows and losses, we are being taught that men are brothers and that God is the *Great Father*.

3. The Empire will be poorer for many a day. A priest relates how a man called upon him to tell him about his misfortunes. He had formerly been very successful, never having had to do a day's hard work in his life. But something happened through which he lost nearly every penny he possessed. 'He told me his tale,' said the priest; 'then he added—"Father, you will still be welcome at my table, but you will have to bring with you what you want to eat, for I shall only be able to give you a knife and fork." "What are you going to do?' the priest asked him. 'Do!' he cried, 'I am going to work; the gate beyond the stars is not shut yet. As long as the gate is open, and the Master is on the doorstep, I can face and push through my troubles and difficulties.' And that man, instead of bewailing his fate, rose up, and, for the first time in his life, put his shoulder to the wheel. He is getting on, because, as he says, he has Jesus Christ behind him.

It will be like that, I hope, with our Empire. The struggle has been a hard one—the hardest ever known in the world. But the stories of the battles have not been the grandest thing about it. It is the fact that thousands of our brothers have counted life as nothing because they believed

that in laying it down they were bringing some great good to the world. They have been willing prisoners too, just that others might be free.

4. Empire Day is coming round again. There is one word that your mother often says to you when you are setting out to school in the morning. It is 'Remember.' Your brothers have died and are dying for the years to come. They have died that you, while you live, may have the blessedness of freedom. *Remember* this on the 24th of May. It makes you, it makes all of us, debtors. Let us ask ourselves, How can we ever repay the sacrifice?

What have I given,
Bold sailor on the Sea,
In earth or heaven,
That you should die for me?

What can I give,
O soldier leal and brave,
Long as I live,
To pay the life you gave?

Every big boy and every girl knows the only answer that can be given. It is 'I can give nothing, but I can resolve to be worthy of the great Sacrifice.' In this you will need God's help. Ask it: He has promised to give it. It was the life Jesus Christ lived on earth that made such sacrifices possible to men. He suffered and died to make us good. Those who love Him, and who feel that through Him they can look beyond death without fear, often say to themselves, 'With a great sum obtained I this freedom.' Ah! my boys and girls, the story of our Empire during the past months and the life that was lived in Galilee nearly two thousand years ago have much to do with each other.

On Empire Day, have your fun. But don't forget to be proud of the Empire. Repeat the text in the morning and think about it. 'With a great sum obtained I this freedom.'

II.

A Garden.—Gn 2⁹.

Do you remember how we spoke about the four gardens of the Bible and how I told you that God has given each of us a garden to keep for Him—the garden of the soul?

Now you know there are all sorts of gardens,

Some of them look very untidy and neglected, and others are neat and well-cared-for. You can generally tell what kind of people live in a house by looking at their garden.

We don't want our soul-gardens to grow untidy and ugly, do we? We want them to grow more and more beautiful. Now if they are to be beautiful we must take some trouble with them, because, you know, gardens don't take care of themselves. And so I think the first thing we must do is to make sure that they are *well-enclosed*.

Why do people build a wall round a garden? To protect it, and to keep out anything that would harm it. Of course we have no wild beasts in this country, but we sometimes hear of rabbits getting into gardens, and doing a lot of damage by nibbling the young green things. I know of two cows who got into a lady's garden by mistake. Somebody had left the gate open, and the cows walked in and trampled on her beautiful flower-beds, and left their hoof-marks on her lawn.

So we must build a wall of defence round our soul-gardens to protect them against the wild beasts of temptation from without. The best defence we can build is the defence of prayer. You remember how Jesus told His disciples to watch and pray lest they enter into temptation.

But besides being well-enclosed *a garden must be cultivated*.

If people let things grow as they like, and allow the weeds to flourish, their garden soon becomes a wilderness. They must prune the trees so that they bear more fruit, they must tend the delicate plants with care and pull up the weeds. And so it is with the gardens of our souls. We must pull up the weeds of sin and bad habits—the weeds of laziness, and selfishness, and untruthfulness, and bad temper—or they will soon overrun the place and spoil our garden. And we must cultivate the good things—the flowers of unselfishness, and kindness, and love.

This requires a great deal of patience. There was once a little girl who went to spend Easter at North Berwick on the East coast of Scotland. She was very fond of climbing North Berwick Law—a hill close to the town. When she went home again she sowed some flower-seeds in her garden, but after a week or two she grew tired of waiting for the seeds to come up, so she dug up her garden, and built North Berwick Law in the middle of it. But she was very sorry when a week or two later

her sister's seeds came up, and she had none. So don't get tired, if the flowers in your soul-garden take long to grow. Don't lose patience and dig them up, for they are sure to flourish some day, if you tend them carefully.

Lastly, *a garden must be well-watered*.

Sometimes after a long dry spell in summer you have seen the flowers drooping their heads and looking very weary. What do they need to revive them? A good shower of rain. And our soul-gardens need rain too, the refreshing rain of God's Spirit. So we must ask God to give us His Holy Spirit in order that our gardens may be kept fresh and beautiful, and that they may be made fit for His fair Garden of Paradise.

III.

The Guarded Heart.

'Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.'—Pr 4²³.

Once upon a time there lived in Ceylon a king called Thossakin, and he had a wonderful gift, at least so the story says. He could take out his heart whenever he liked, and put it in again. This was very useful when he was going on any dangerous expedition, because, you see, he could leave his heart safely at home, and then no one could kill him. Now it happened that Thossakin went to war with Rama, and went out to fight against him. He wished to leave his heart at home, in a very safe place. After thinking of all sorts of places to put it in, he decided to shut it up in a box, and give it to some one to keep. Now there are not very many people you can trust with your heart, so he had to consider the matter very carefully indeed. At last he thought the best thing to do was to give it to a hermit; living by himself in a lonely place, and this he did. Then he went to war, and try as he would, Rama could not kill him. Then Rama consulted a friend of his. 'How is it,' he said, 'that my arrows hit Thossakin, and yet do him no harm?' Now the friend was a magician, and by his magic he found out where the heart was, and then, changing himself into the form of the king, he went to the hermit and asked him for the box. The hermit gave it to him without any suspicion, and the magician crushed it in his hands and King Thossakin fell dead.

The moral of this story (if it has one) would be

that you should be very careful where you keep your heart, and who you trust it to. Here is another fairy tale, from India. There was once a monkey who struck up a friendship with a shark, and used to feed him with fruit from a tree. One day the shark invited the monkey to come home with him on a visit, to which the monkey agreed. But just as they were about to start, the shark happened to remark, 'Our sultan is ill, and nothing can cure him but a monkey's heart.' 'Ah,' said the monkey, 'now I understand your kind invitation. But don't you know that we monkeys always leave our hearts in trees, and go about without them?' And he made his escape.

There are many people and things who will seek your heart, but be careful where you trust it. Some people set their hearts on whatever is nice and pleasant. They shut their hearts up in them, and when they lose the good things their hearts are broken. Some people take no care to protect their hearts from the arrows of temptation that are always shooting at them, and so they are badly wounded. Other people are ready to go with any one who asks them, without caring whether their company is good or bad, and too late they find that their hearts are eaten up by sin, and destroyed. The wise man who wrote the Book of Proverbs said, 'Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.'

But you can safely trust your heart to those who love you; and who loves you better, and can keep it better, than the Lord Jesus Christ? And He says to you, 'Give me thy heart.'

IV.

The Rev. George C. Leader has made the attempt to teach the Life of Christ to children by means of a series of children's sermons. He has been successful, and his success ought to encourage others to make the attempt. The title of the book is *Follow the Christ* (Allenson; 2s, 6d. net). This is one of the sermons.

JESUS THE PATRIOT.

When George the Third came to the throne he won the hearts of his new subjects by saying, 'I glory in the name of Briton.' Every man glories in the land of his birth, for love of country is inborn in the human race.

A lady traveller in Montenegro tells us she has seen a Montenegrin, crossing the frontier into his

native land after long absence, bend down and kiss the soil. Bishop Welldon, when he visited Japan, came to a boys' school in Tokio, and asked the master what would be the highest ambition of his scholars; the answer was that if he were to inquire of ten of them what fate they would covet for themselves, as many as eight of them would choose the happiness of laying down their lives for their country.

In the present war we have seen innumerable examples of patriotism; with splendid eagerness our young men have flocked to the colours, counting no sacrifice too great to make for the sake of the dear fatherland. There is something about a man's own land that draws out his loyalty and love as no other land can do.

Now, in Jesus we always find the best of everything that is good in human nature; so we are not surprised to find that He is Jesus the Patriot. He came of a patriotic people. One of their poets cried long ago, 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.'

You remember the story of the Hebrew prince Daniel, how, in his captivity in Babylon, he never failed to pray three times a day, with his windows open toward Jerusalem. The Jews to-day wail over their ruined Temple as they lean against the few fragments that are left; and on the graves of Jews who die away from their loved fatherland is sprinkled earth from the Holy Land.

Then, too, that part of the Holy Land from which Jesus came was famous for its patriotism. 'Nowhere was patriotism so intense' as in Galilee, whose history is full of the heroic deeds of men ever ready to risk their lives for the liberty of their fatherland. And it was a patriotic home from which Jesus came. Jesus, as you know, had younger brothers; they all bear patriotic names—Joseph their father had named them after national heroes. Mary, Jesus' mother, dearly loved her native land. In the first chapter of Luke you will find a song, the Magnificat, sung by her before Jesus came, a song which shows how dear to her was the land of her fathers.

The very first public act of Jesus was an act of patriotism. When the men of Israel came in their thousands to John to be baptized, thus showing that they forsook all evil and wished to be members

of the new kingdom of righteousness soon to be set up, Jesus came and was baptized. He had no sins to repent of, but He wished to take part in the baptism because it was a national movement towards righteousness. His baptism had deeper meanings than that, as you will find by and by ; but this was one meaning. Jesus, because He loved His country, could not keep out of any movement that helped to make His country more righteous, just as the true patriot to-day must help forward all good causes such as Temperance and Purity and Peace, because these movements help the people forward to prosperity and happiness.

We have another instance of the Patriotism of Jesus at the end of His earthly ministry. Before Jesus went away from His disciples He commanded them to preach the 'Good News' of His life and death and resurrection in all the world, 'beginning at Jerusalem.'

All through His life on earth we get glimpses here and there of the Patriotism of Jesus. There was no one outside the reach of His love, but it was 'the lost sheep of the House of Israel' whom He sought most of all and first of all.

In the Gospel story we have one specially beautiful picture of our Lord's love for the land of His birth. In one of His sermons He breaks out in passionate sorrow with these words : 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her ! how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not !' Many a time, when a little lad, Jesus had seen the watchful mother-bird, disturbed perhaps by the shadow of the fierce hawk swooping down from the sky, call her little chicks to her and spread her broad wings over them. He could see the shadow of the grim Roman eagle drawing nearer and nearer ; He called the people to shelter under the shadow of His wing ; it was one of His keenest sorrows that they would not.

You will read some day of the horrors of the Roman siege of Jerusalem, how, in the city where Christ was crucified, there was not found wood enough to make crosses for the citizens whom the Romans reckoned as rebels against their rule. All this Jesus foresaw, and from all this He would have saved the people. But they would not.

The greatest thing any one can do for his country is to die for it. The history of our own land is lit up with instances of men and women who have

given up life for love of fatherland. This unhappy war has its gleams of glory in the story of multitudes who show the reality of their patriotism by their willingness to make this final sacrifice. At the head of all who have died for their country we must place Jesus Christ. He died for His country as truly as any soldier ever died upon the battlefield. Of course we know He died for all men ; He loved Gentiles as well as Jews ; every man in every land can say, 'He died for me.' But in a very special sense He died for His own chosen country. It was a Hebrew writer who said, 'He was wounded for *our* transgressions' ; and the New Testament writer who understood the meaning of His Cross better than any other man said that it was the power of God unto salvation—'to the Jew first.'

We notice as we study the Patriotism of Jesus how practical it was. He DID something for the country that He loved.

Always in every land there is a good deal of pot-house patriotism. Men in their drink shout 'Rule Britannia,' and they roll out in their rollicking fashion, 'Britons never, *never*, NEVER shall be slaves' ; and all the while they are slaves themselves, slaves to that strong drink which is more dangerous to Britain than the Germans or any other people ever can be. They are not helping their country but injuring it. The true patriot, on the other hand, if he cannot die for his country, will certainly live for it, and do all he can for its well-being.

Many of you lads are too young to serve your country in the Army or the Navy, although I do not doubt many of you would be proud and glad of that opportunity. I know a little lad of twelve who said the other day that he hoped the war would last until he was old enough to join and do his bit, and perhaps many of you can understand how he felt. Well, we don't want the war to drag on like that ; and besides, we need not wait at all before beginning to do our bit. We can serve our country now. The Boy Scouts have shown us how splendidly boys under military age can prove their patriotism.

Some of you lads, too young to fight, can work and get wages to help mother, who has let the older boys go to the war ; and the more cheerful and contented you are in working to keep the house going until the big boys come home, the better patriots you will be. It will not be so exciting or interesting as the camp or the battlefield, but it will be all the more heroic for that.

I suppose if I were to ask you lads what king of modern times has shown the most splendid patriotism, you would answer King Albert of Belgium. Yes, that noble king has shown most magnificent patriotism, and the world will never let his story fade. But we must not forget that he has had an opportunity which other kings have been denied. They would have done the same in his place, and they are not less patriotic because the chance has not come to them in that particular way.

There is a story told of King Humbert of Italy. He was invited to a banquet at Genoa at a time when the cholera was raging at Naples. He replied, 'Men are feasting at Genoa ; men are dying at Naples—I go to Naples.' That was patriotism too of just the quality of King Albert's.

Our own good King, who has so freely given his sons, and who is in so many ways himself arduously serving the country, is just as true a patriot. All who do all that is in their power to do for the land they love are patriots.

We notice that Jesus, as a Patriot, was not blind to His country's faults. Again and again He rebuked the people—because He loved them. He could not see them going the wrong way without trying to stop them. The true patriot does not cry, 'My country right or wrong.' The true patriot does not want his country to come out top by trampling others down. Jesus did not hesitate to rebuke His country's sins ; and if the people had heeded His reproof, they would have been saved much sorrow and distress ; for it was because He loved them He rebuked them. But the people of His day were like many people in our own time—they thought that no one could be their friend who told them their faults. Really the best friends of any people are those who are not afraid to tell them of their sins ; for if they save people from sin, they save them from the sorrow that always follows sin.

If the Christian teachers of Germany had been brave enough to rebuke the men who delight in war and to proclaim to them the wickedness of breaking faith with a weaker nation, perhaps this war might never have been, and Germany would have become a really great nation, without that blot upon its history which shames it to-day.

When we study the Patriotism of Jesus we learn one other lesson, and that is that patriotism is but a stage to something bigger and grander still. Our Lord commanded His disciples to begin telling

the 'Good News' at Jerusalem, but He went on to tell them to carry it to the uttermost parts of the earth. That was another way of saying that love of one's own land is to lead to the love of all lands. Real love is a quality that grows. The higher in character that people are, the broader grows their love. The lowest kind of people love themselves ; from love of self it is just a step higher to love of family, and another step to love of the tribe, and yet another to love of the nation. But this is not the highest love ; the highest love is like God's own love, a love for the whole world. Patriotism is meant to lead to that.

God has implanted in us all a spark of love to our own people that the flame may spread to all mankind. Love of our fatherland is to grow into love of God's fatherland, the world. Patriotism is to go forward to love. That was the Patriotism of Jesus, and that must be ours.

Point and Illustration.

A President of Cornell.

Two octogenarians have published their autobiography this winter. Bishop Browne of Bristol is the one ; President William Fletcher King of Cornell is the other. President King calls his book simply *Reminiscences* (Abingdon Press).

Bishop Browne had a great store of anecdotes to tell, and he knew how to tell them. President King has his stories also, and he can tell them, but they are more serious. His memory is an amazement. From earliest youth to latest age he easily remembers every detail of his experiences. Is a sense of humour ever given along with a great memory ?

It is the minuteness of memory that gives the book of reminiscences its interest. President King's life has had its providences—whose life has not ? The difference is that these providential dealings are recalled vividly and vividly related. We enter into them. We become a part of them. The works of the imagination may have a higher place than the works of historical recollection ; but a trustworthy narrative always finds us.

Here is a good example. 'One night my mother dreamed that we had no President and that a government official had been sent for her son to train him up to fill the office. She interpreted her dream as meaning that President Harrison was deceased. She told the family her dream as soon

as she got up in the morning, insisting that we would be informed of the fact before breakfast was over. I well remember father's laughing reply to her that we had not even heard that he was sick, but she insisted that she was sure that she was right and that in less than two hours he would be convinced. Just as we sat down to the table, John Ramsey, a neighbor, who lived at the cross roads, half a mile away, rapped on the door and on being admitted, he at once told the sad news. He had received word from Zanesville that President Harrison was dead. Under the circumstances this news was very surprising.

Before the Civil War (in which he 'did his bit') Dr. King was sent south to see for himself what slavery meant. He attended a slave sale at Murfreesboro. 'The most remarkable case was that of a woman about thirty years old, who was put on a block outside the courthouse wall, with a crowd of two or three hundred men standing around, and a red-faced, burly auctioneer standing by her side. She held a young babe in her arms. The auctioneer made various comments as to her appearance and showed her off in very unbecoming style, making her show her teeth, and in other ways treated her just as though she were a horse. Coarse men came up and felt her limbs to test what kind of muscles she had. It was the most disgusting performance we had ever witnessed. The repulsive scene was impressing on us the side of slavery of which we had seen and heard nothing in the hospitable homes of the blue grass region or the families where we were guests at West Point.

My brother and I stood together as the bidding began and the scene became most interesting and trying. The auctioneer seemed to pride himself on his rough language and unbecoming treatment of the woman. She bore the indignities with a certain air of dignity. Her husband was in the crowd near where my brother and I stood and near him was his owner. There were two bidders actively bidding for her, one the owner of her husband and the other a slave-driver who shipped slaves to the cotton fields of the South. As the bidding progressed the husband of the woman pleaded with his owner in a most plaintive way to buy his wife. As we stood by we heard him say, "I have been faithful in my serving you, and if I had my wife and children with me, you know that I could serve you even better." His owner seemed

to bid carelessly, while the slave-trader on the other side of the crowd seemed to bid with more interest. As the bidding progressed the husband kept pleading with his owner in a most touching manner to bid more. My brother and I standing together got so wrought up that we thought it prudent to step apart, lest we should utterly break down and show our sympathies and get into serious trouble. The bidding went on for a half hour, all the time the owner of the husband bidding with little interest and making only slight advances over the other man, and the other bidding with apparent purpose of securing the woman. Finally the mother and child were sold to the slave-trader.'

The Bible and the War.

Some years ago an American member of the family of Moulton made a name for himself, and created something like a library of books, by discovering that the Bible could be treated as literature apart from all questions of religion or ethics. One of the books thus brought into being is *The Literary Primacy of the Bible*, by George P. Eckman (Methodist Book Concern; \$1 net). The volume contains the second course of Mendenhall Lectures, delivered at De Pauw University. There were six lectures, with the following titles: (1) The Literary Primacy of the Bible; (2) The Poetry and Oratory of the Bible; (3) The Fiction and Humor of the Bible; (4) The Bible the most Persistent Force in Literature; (5) The Bible as Ethical and Spiritual Literature; (6) The Bible as Inspired Literature. These lectures are republished as they were delivered, so that the book has the advantage (together with whatever disadvantage there may be) of the spoken word. It has clearness and simplicity and the human touch. Not only was the lecturer in touch with his audience, he was in touch also with the great men in literature who have said memorable things about the Bible. This is an example:

'The scene is the first Colonial Congress in 1774. To the proposal that the session be opened with prayer, Mr. Jay of New York and Mr. Rutledge of South Carolina objected on the ground that there existed such a diversity of religious sentiments among the members as made it impracticable for them to join in the same act of worship. Then glorious old Sam Adams arose, and avowing that he was no bigot, said: "I can hear a prayer from

any man of piety who is at the same time a friend to his country." A clergyman was thereupon invited to perform the sacred office. He read the psalm for the day [second] in the order of his church. Bancroft says that "it seemed as if Heaven itself was uttering its oracle." Intelligence had just been received of the terrible bombardment of Boston. The New Englanders present believed that the lives of their friends were being taken by their foes at that very moment. They were profoundly moved as they listened to the ringing sentences of the thirty-fifth psalm, beginning:

Strive thou, O Jehovah, with them that strive with me:

Fight thou against them that fight against me.

Take hold of shield and buckler,
And stand up for my help.

Draw out also the spear, and stop the way
against them that pursue me;

Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation.

Let them be put to shame and brought to
dishonour that seek after my soul:

Let them be turned back and confounded that
devise my hurt.

Let them be as chaff before the wind,
And the angel of Jehovah driving them on.'

Walker of Tinnevelly.

Mrs. Amy Wilson-Carmichael has written many books, and some of them have been very successful. In undertaking to write the life of *Walker of Tinnevelly* (Morgan & Scott), she undertook her hardest task. For there was nothing to speak of in the way of material except a diary, and that diary was at once voluminous and very scrappy. Has she succeeded? It is hard to say. The present reviewer has read the book from cover to cover. But then he is particularly interested in biography and in missions. How many more will have endurance to reach the end of four hundred and fifty pages of small close type, much of which consists of short extracts from a diary, the sentences of which are mostly unfinished?

But it is not necessary to read every word or nearly every word of the book to recognize the greatness of Thomas Walker. Mrs. Wilson-

Carmichael's own writing is so discriminating, and so good as writing, that her paragraphs alone will be sufficient. Throughout the history of missionary enterprise we have not often had a more gifted, courageous, or self-forgetting ambassador for Christ. There seems to have been more in the journal than could be put in print. For on one page we are told that 'the strong meat which abounds in journal and memoranda, for the most part has to be withheld.' But there is enough—enough, we say, even in the biographer's connecting links—to give us a vivid picture of a great Christian personality.

We shall refer to two matters only. The hardest trial of Mr. Walker's life (he was a C.M.S. Missionary, but essentially and consumedly an evangelist) was the capture by their kinsfolk of young girls who wished to be baptized for Christ. Young men could always look after themselves. 'There are hours of life which burn. Such an hour had to be lived through upon April 12th when, with Mrs. Walker alone in prayer in the room on one side of the bungalow, and the child with those who loved her, waiting in tension beyond speech, on the other, he in the room between, while wicked men and women clamoured around him, pleaded, reasoned, threatened, in vain. Power, the power of lawful authority, was on the wrong side that day; the child had to be given up. With a set white face and eyes that looked unutterable things, he left the room, when the deed was done, and threw himself upon his knees. There were few prayers in words in the house that day. There are things that scorch words.'

But that was not the end this time. Early in August, says the biographer, there is a bright record in the journal; 'he must have wanted to dip his pen in something other than common ink the night he wrote: "— came, bringing little M. [spoils of battle], accompanied by Price" [as escort]; for God had interposed, and in open Court, by the consent of all concerned, the child was given up to the people of her choice. "I sent you out with mourning and weeping; but God will give (yea rather, has given) you back to me with joy and gladness for ever." In some such words the Dohnavur family, with the child set in the midst, praised and rejoiced; and he who had suffered before as only a chivalrous man can suffer in the presence of wrong triumphant, could not rest till he had heard the whole story of the

deliverance: and his prayer that night was a song.'

He conducted at one stage a great mission of evangelization to the Syrian Christians of India. Here is a picture:

'The meetings were always an amazement. Besides the general meetings, there were separate gatherings for leaders; and women's meetings were arranged for other members of the party—curious women's meetings they appeared at first, for the mass of a thousand to fifteen hundred women was invariably fringed by a wide border of men—five thousand was the count one day.'

'To this audience thus prepared the speaker would come punctual to the second, for the evening

meetings always began in time. Quietly he would work his way through the packed masses to the wide, low platform; and then there would be a gradual hush, passing down from the platform to the far-out edge of the crowd while he knelt down, and once more stretched out his hands to the Unseen, and, as it seemed, received gifts for men. Then the address, broken by the interpretation sometimes twice or three times repeated by interpreters stationed at intervals through the great throng, and even so unspoiled—how describe it? Sometimes it was like hearing waters fall from high places, pure waters of refreshment; sometimes the eager sentences following hard the one upon the other were like leaping flames.'

The Booksshelf by the Fire.

BY THE REV. GEORGE JACKSON, B.A., PROFESSOR OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY,
DIDSBURY COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

II.

Richard Baxter's Autobiography.

BOSWELL tells us that he once asked Johnson what works of Richard Baxter's he should read. 'Read any of them,' said Johnson; 'they are all good.' Johnson's appreciation of Baxter was intelligent and sincere, and it is the more noteworthy because of his general dislike of everything Puritan. Yet it may well be doubted if either he or any other son of man could speak with knowledge of 'all' Baxter's works. They number, it is said, no less than a hundred and sixty-eight separate publications; and though many of them, of course, were only sermons or pamphlets, others were of prodigious bulk. Altogether, it has been calculated, his writings would fill sixty octavo volumes of some thirty to forty thousand closely printed pages. When Judge Jeffreys sneered at Baxter as having written 'books enough to load a cart,' he was for once in a way not far from the truth. 'No more diligent student,' says the writer of the article on Baxter in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 'ever shut himself up with his books.' He had no amanuensis to whom he could dictate, he hardly knew what good health meant, yet, thanks to his indomitable industry and zeal, he became 'the creator of our

popular Christian literature,'¹ and the most voluminous theological writer in our language.

It is, however, but the tiniest fraction of the results of these vast labours which retains for us either interest or value. The rest have long ago—to borrow Mr. Hallam's phrase—ceased to belong to men, and have become the property of moths. When Dr. Grosart says that 'there never has been a day since 1649 that something by him was not in print,' he is probably right; but when he adds, 'his works have still a matchless circulation among the English-speaking race,'² one wonders if there is a bookseller in the land who would endorse his judgment. With one or two exceptions, such as *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*,³ *A Call to the Un-*

¹ The phrase is Dr. Grosart's.

² In his article in *The Dictionary of National Biography*.

³ Of this the most famous and, save one, the earliest of Baxter's works, there is an admirable edition (abridged) published by the Religious Tract Society. May I take the opportunity to quote Dr. Stalker's touching tribute: 'The young reader, across whose heart the shadows of disappointment have never yet fallen, opens the book and wonders where its charm can lie. But those who labour and are heavy laden, who have accompanied their dearest to the gates of

converted, and *The Reformed Pastor*, Baxter's works have vanished even from that last refuge of the poor author, the shelves and catalogues of the second-hand dealer. It is idle to lament or to protest. Every age must write its own books, and authors, like other men, must be content, when they have served their own generation, to fall on sleep. Nevertheless, if it be not already too late, there is at least one other book of Baxter's besides those which have been named that one would fain save from the dark waters of oblivion—I mean his *Autobiography*.

I.

The full title of the book is as follows: *Reliquiae Baxterianæ; or, Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of his Life and Times*, faithfully published from his own original manuscript by Matthew Sylvester. It consists of three parts and an appendix, and was composed at various periods during the years following the Restoration and the close of Baxter's ministry in Kidderminster,¹ thus—

Part I., 'written for the most part in 1664.'

Part II., 'written in 1665.'

Part III., 'written for the most part in the year 1670; to which are subjoined additions of the years 1675, 1676, 1677, 1678, etc.'

The Appendix, consisting of letters and other documents.

The book was first published in a large folio volume of some eight hundred pages in 1696, five years after Baxter's death. Unfortunately it has never been reprinted. Calamy published an abridgement of it in 1702; Dr. Wordsworth an extract in the fifth volume of his *Ecclesiastical Biography* in 1810; S. T. Coleridge,

the unknown country and said the bitter farewell, those who have buried the impossible ambitions, and hopeless hopes of youth, those who have found out how difficult it is to know the most momentous things and how trivial are the things we know, those who have long endured the loathsome insistence of temptation and besetting sin—all these feel in the book the touch of a brother's hand and the throb of a heart which understands them. So long as the world is full of tears, and men still look for the star of hope to rise above it, this book may perhaps endure' (*The Evangelical Succession lectures*, second series).

¹ It may be convenient to give the chief dates of Baxter's career: born, 1615; pastor of Kidderminster (with a brief interval during the Civil War), 1641–1660; farewell to the Church of England, 1662; trial before Judge Jeffreys, 1685; death, 1691.

in his *Notes on English Divines*, a considerable number of very short passages together with his own comments, in 1853; and more recently (1910) the Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jayne) has reprinted the closing pages of Part I., together with an introduction and notes, and the essay on Baxter by Sir James Stephen, under the title of *Richard Baxter's Self-Review*.² Unless, therefore, the reader has access to the rare and costly folio of 1696, he must meanwhile content himself as best he can with one or other of these fragmentary reprints. This is very greatly to be regretted, and it is no small reproach to English scholarship that a document of such priceless worth to the student of the seventeenth century still remains so inaccessible to the general reader. For, neglected as the book has been, it is no exaggeration to say that it is much the most permanently valuable of all the writings which we owe to Baxter's busy pen. His religious works, for the most part, speak to us in a language which is no longer ours, and have gone the way of the discarded theological moulds in which of necessity they were cast. To the *Reliquiae* belongs the undying interest of every genuine transcript of a human life. Written throughout with absolute sincerity and truthfulness—'I could almost as soon doubt the Gospel verity,' said Coleridge, 'as his veracity'³—Baxter's *Autobiography* can be forgotten only when Englishmen have ceased to care about one of the most fruitful and formative periods of their national history.

II.

Having said so much of the *Autobiography* as a whole, I shall limit myself, in what follows, to the brief excerpt to be found in the Bishop of Chester's volume already referred to. I do this partly because the excerpt, brief as it is, is much the most noteworthy section of the whole; partly because the Bishop's volume is within every one's reach, and also because the *Reliquiae*, even if it were accessible, in its original form, is too big and heavy for our 'Bookshelf by the Fire.' But before going further, let us pause a moment longer to

² Longmans.

³ *Notes on English Divines*, vol. ii. p. 68. Cp. Professor Dowden's judgment: 'Baxter's *Autobiography*', he says, 'has one quality which is among the rarest in books of its kind, and which gives it a value almost unique—it is written with absolute sincerity' (*Puritan and Anglican*, p. 215).

note three striking tributes to this portion of Baxter's narrative.¹

In the third of the lectures delivered in 1857 by Dean Stanley on the Study of Ecclesiastical History, which now form the introduction to his well-known *History of the Eastern Church*, he has the following: 'Take that admirable summary of mature Christian experience, which ought to be in the hands of every student of Ecclesiastical History—one might well add of every student of theology, of every English minister of religion—which is contained in Baxter's review of his own narrative of his life and times. See how he there corrects the narrowness, the sectarianism, the dogmatism of his youth, by the comprehensive wisdom acquired in long years of persecution of labour and devotion.' In 1875, when he unveiled Baxter's statue at Kidderminster, the Dean told the public how his attention was first drawn to Baxter's words: 'It is now many years ago since, on one of the few occasions when I had the pleasure of meeting the late Sir James Stephen, he recommended me, with his own peculiar solemnity, to read the last twenty-four pages of the first part of Baxter's *Narrative of his Own Life*. "Lose not a day in reading it," he said; "you will never repent it." That very night I followed his advice, and I have ever since publicly and privately advised every theological student to do the same.'²

From Stanley let us turn to Sir James Stephen himself. Writing of Baxter's Autobiography in the essay referred to above, he says: 'Towards the close of the first book occurs the passage which though often republished and familiar to most students of English literature,³ must yet be noticed as the most impressive record in our own language, if not in any tongue, of the gradual ripening of a powerful mind under the culture of incessant study, wide experience, and anxious self-observation.'

My third quotation is from Professor Dowden. After speaking of Jeremy Taylor's *Eirenicon*—'an Eirenicon which came from the victorious side, from the party in power, and in the hour of

triumph'—he goes on to say that a still more remarkable and beautiful utterance of that spirit which is peaceable and pure came from the party that suffered persecution; and it is to be found in those 'memorable pages' in which Baxter tells us of the changes that came over his mind and temper and opinions with advancing years. 'When these pages were written, the close of Baxter's life was still remote, and he had much work as a Christian teacher, and a great Englishman, still to do. But he had already learnt the deepest lessons of life, and was ready to depart. "Ripeness," in Hamlet's phrase, "is all."'⁴

III.

It is time now to open the book itself. And no one, I think, on whichever side his sympathies may lie in the great struggle of the seventeenth century, can read in it long without feeling the strange attraction of the brave, honest, kindly nature which it everywhere reveals. Baxter was a Puritan, and Puritanism is still for many only another name for harsh censoriousness and spiritual pride; yet what could be more moving in its tenderness and humility than this: 'To have sinned while I preached and wrote against sin, and had such abundant and great obligations from God, and made so many promises against it, doth lay me very low: not so much in fear of hell, as in great displeasure against myself, and such self-abhorrence as would cause revenge upon myself, were it not forbidden. When God forgiveth me I cannot forgive myself; especially for any rash words or deeds, by which I have seemed injurious and less tender and kind, than I should have been to my near and dear relations, whose love abundantly obliged me. When such are dead, though we never differed in points of interest, on any great matter, every sour or cross provoking word which I gave them, maketh me almost unconcileable to myself.' To others, again, Puritanism stands for a morbid self-concern, the finger always on the pulse, the eye always turned inward; yet here is Baxter preaching the gospel of 'healthymindedness' in a fashion that might have satisfied William James himself: 'I was once wont to meditate most on my own heart, and to dwell all at home, and look little higher: I was still poring either on my sins or wants, or examining my sincerity; but now, though I am greatly convinced

¹ In the paragraphs which immediately follow, the reference in each case is to that portion of the Autobiography contained in Bishop Jayne's reprint.

² *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. xxxii. p. 390.

³ Very polite this, no doubt, on Sir James's part, but also, one fears, very far from the truth.

⁴ *Puritan and Anglican*, pp. 214-215, 230.

of the need of heart acquaintance and employment, yet I see more need of a higher work; and that I should look oftener upon Christ, and God, and heaven, than upon my own heart. At home I can find distempers to trouble me, and some evidences of my peace, but it is above that I must find matter of delight and joy, and love and peace itself. Therefore I would have one thought at home upon myself and sins, and many thoughts above upon the high and amiable and beatifying objects.' Again, Baxter was a controversialist, and no more eager champion ever entered the lists. It was, he says, his strong natural inclination 'to speak of every subject just as it is, and to call a spade a spade'; but he acknowledges 'some want of honour and love or tenderness to others . . . and therefore I repent of it, and wish all over-sharp passages were expunged from my writings, and desire forgiveness of God and man.'

Perhaps the most delightful surprise in these intimate self-revelations, at least for those whose former reading has not prepared them to look for it, is the mingled honesty and humility of Baxter's intellectual life. Formerly, he says, where any temptation to religious doubt assailed him, he was wont to cast it aside, 'as fitter to be abhorred than considered of; yet now,' he goes on, 'this would not give me satisfaction; but I was fain to dig to the very foundations, and seriously to examine the reasons of Christianity, and to give a hearing to all that could be said against it, that so my faith might be indeed my own. And at last I found that *nil tam certum quamquod ex dubio certum*; nothing is so firmly believed as that which hath been sometime doubted of.' Nor would he pretend to a certainty which was not his merely because it was held a dishonour to be less certain. 'Even of the mysteries of the Gospel,' he writes, 'I must needs say that whatever men may pretend, the subjective certainty cannot go beyond the objective evidence; for it is caused thereby as the print on the wax is caused by that on the seal.' And therefore, while some things are certain, others are less so, and others are not so at all; we can but bow our heads and say we do not know. Baxter had an almost pathetic confidence in the power of reasoning; much and very much he himself owed to the reasonings of others; but he came to see that when man has said his last word there still remain questions to which the only answer is that there is no answer. 'Heretofore,'

he says, 'I knew much less than now; and yet was not half so much acquainted with my ignorance. I had a great delight in the daily new discoveries which I made, and of the light which shined in upon me (like a man that cometh into a country where he never was before); but I little knew how imperfectly I understood those very points whose discovery so much delighted me, nor how much might be said against them; nor how many things I was yet a stranger to. But now I find far greater darkness upon all things, and perceive how very little it is that we know in comparison of that which we are ignorant of.' And, as it was with himself, so was it also with others to whom he looked for guidance: 'Experience hath constrained me against my will to know that reverend learned men are imperfect, and know but little as well as I; especially those that think themselves the wisest. And the better I am acquainted with them, the more I perceive that we are all yet in the dark.' *We are all yet in the dark*—this is not the Puritanism whose voice the world knows too well, harsh and strident, challenging heaven and earth with its confident solutions of the eternal mystery; this is Puritanism with bowed head, silent, humbly seeking for some one to guide it.

It is here that we see Baxter at his best. This is the temper which has won for him the title of 'The great Catholic of Puritanism.' 'I had rather,' he said, 'be a martyr for love than for any other article of the Christian creed.' And with that noble saying his whole life was in accord. He was all for charity and comprehension. He knew his own mind; he was ready at all times earnestly to contend for the faith, as he understood it; yet he made it his aim always to 'bear with them that Christ will bear with.' 'I am not for narrowing the Church,' he wrote, 'more than Christ Himself alloweth us; nor for robbing Him of any of His flock.' And so we find him lamenting that the writings of 'the ancient schismatics and heretics (as they were called)' have not survived, for then he thinks it would have been manifest that 'few of them were so bad as their adversaries made them.' Neither will he pass 'a peremptory sentence of damnation upon all that never heard of Christ; having some more reason than I knew of before to think that God's dealing with such is much unknown to us.' So, too, in regard to the Papists: once he thought it well proved that a

Papist could not go beyond a reprobate; 'but now I doubt not but that God hath many sanctified ones among them who have received the true doctrine of Christianity so practically that their contradictory errors prevail not against them to hinder their love of God and their salvation.'

It costs nothing to say these things to-day; they have long since become the commonplace, and almost the cant, of the street; the veriest trifler gives them his lazy assent. But it was otherwise in the seventeenth century. In those days Truth's boundaries were traced with a firm and unwavering

hand, and woe to him who dared to transgress them! That God had His portion in the Puritans, His inheritance in the Reformed Churches of the Continent, no man of Baxter's way of thinking had any doubt; but what concord could He have with the Man of Sin whose seat was on the seven hills of Rome? That Baxter with his sturdy Protestantism and inborn love of disputation should yet have been able so far to break through the trammels of his age and serve himself heir to the great Catholic traditions of the centuries is perhaps the strongest of his many claims to the attention and goodwill of the reader to-day.

Contributions and Comments.

1 Timothy i. 14.

ST. PAUL's use of superlatives, to which Mr. Martin Pope recalls attention, has been often commented on. It is much more than a linguistic peculiarity: it always reveals a struggle to give adequate expression to deep emotion. He coins or intensifies words because familiar words cannot express the fulness of his heart. The coining of *ὑπερπλεονάξω* in 1 Ti 1¹⁴ is a striking example of this. Undoubtedly the experience which the apostle is here recalling is his conversion at Damascus; and it gets light and gives light when it is read along with Ac 9⁹⁻¹⁹ and 22¹¹⁻¹⁶ (the narrative in Ac 26 is not so distinctively personal). He is telling what he found in his experience of the grace of the Lord for encouragement of all who had been even as he. Grace overwhelmed him with its graciousness. What was the ideal in his mind when thus striving to describe the exuberance of divine grace? Some take it as an intensified equivalent for 'exceeding abundance'; Mr. Pope seems to regard the figurative word as suggesting an 'overflowing stream.' Surely the apostle's thought was rather of the ocean's fulness—the incoming of the resistless flood-tide from the deep. That is the familiar emblem of the O.T. A river is in flood but for a time, the fathomless depth of the sea is eternal. So psalmists and prophets used it, as the apostle does, as the fit emblem of the infinitude of mercy—in its depths the vilest sins were buried from remembrance for

ever. The grace of the Lord came over the soul of the praying penitent in Damascus as the full flood-tide which rises and overwhelms him it overtakes. St. Paul was familiar with the sea. He spent a night and a day *ἐν τῷ βυθῷ*. (Note his use of *βάθος*, Ro 8⁹ 11³³, 1 Co 2¹⁰, Eph 3¹⁸.) Such a passage as Is 60⁵ may have been in his mind: 'Then thou shalt see and be radiant, and thy heart shall throb, and grow large; for there shall be turned upon thee the sea's flood-tide, and the wealth of the nations shall come to thee.' So George Adam Smith translates, and adds: 'It is liquid light,—light that ripples and sparkles, the light which a face catches from sparkling water. . . . The stately mother of her people. . . . stands upon some great beach, with the sea in front,—the sea that casts up all heaven's light upon her face and drifts all earth's wealth to her feet' (*Book of Isaiah*, ii. p. 430).

Could there be a more perfect emblem of the experience of Saul when the grace of the Lord broke over his soul and he looked up on Ananias, its messenger? To the blind penitent he had said, 'The Lord, even Jesus who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost' (*πλησθῆς Πνεύματος Ἀγίου*). Even such words of grace did not tell all that they meant to the apostle as he looked back on that day. The fulness was not after his measure to receive, but the fulness of God to bestow—*ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ὑπερπλεόνασε*.

And as the prophet saw on the incoming flood-tide of the sea the wealth of the nations borne, so the inflooding and overwhelming grace brought upon its fulness faith and love into his soul. These came with it (*μετά*). Faith came with it; for how could he be any more unbelieving? His heart, 'by mighty grace compelled, surrendered.' John Newton tells the same experience in his verse :

Lord, give me faith—He hears—what grace is this!
Dry up thy tears, my soul, and cease to grieve!
He shews me what He did, and who He is,
I must, I will, I can, I do believe.

He could, therefore, truly regard such faith as 'the gift of God.' It was resistlessly borne in upon his soul by the experience of such overpowering grace. It came as a necessity which was a real liberty. A striking story is told of a watchman on a tower at Callao, when an earthquake, upheaving the ocean bed, hurled a huge wave upon the town and overwhelmed it, and the swelling waters bore close to him a boat into which he got and was saved. So came faith to the apostle's soul for his salvation, through the superabundance of grace which overpowered him.

And love also—'The love which is in Christ Jesus.' The measureless (Eph 3^{18, 19}) love of Christ thus revealed to him, kindled in his soul that love to Christ which from 'that same hour' was the passion and strength of his life—a love in which he was not a whit behind the chiefest apostles, and which constrained him to labour more abundantly than they all (1 Co 15¹⁰, 2 Co 11⁵).

Ellicott explains the expression 'the love which is in Christ Jesus,' as 'in Him as its true sphere and element'; and one has only to recall the story of Ananias and Saul to see that it is so. Ananias, 'a devout man according to the law, and well reported of by all the Jews in Damascus,' as the apostle testifies, was, no doubt, one of Saul's intended victims. On hearing the mission upon which the Lord was sending him he was afraid; but on learning that his would-be persecutor was a chosen vessel for his Lord's service he went straightway, in the obedience of faith already loving one whom his Lord so loved. Saul was more than surprised when saluted, by one he had come to destroy, as 'Brother Saul.' Both in Ac 9 and 22 that loving salutation is preserved Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ. 'In that very hour I looked up on him.' He could never forget that first vision of his

restored eyesight—that loving face of Ananias, reflecting the amazing love of Christ for him. 'As in water, face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man'—of Christian to Christian. In that moment Saul found himself within that fellowship of 'love which is in Christ Jesus.' Never before had he imagined that love which knit the Christian brotherhood. The love of Ananias for him was another amazing element in the grace which had overwhelmed him; it came to him borne on its glorious flood-tide, so that 'his heart throbbed, and was enlarged by its abundance.'

If from that hour Saul's faith was unconquerable and his love for Christ and His brethren unquenchable (2 Co 2⁴ 12¹⁵), these, according to their measure, were to the praise of the glory of the grace which had swept over his soul and buried in its depths his exceeding sins and brought him the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus. And yet while these might 'abound' (πλεονάζω, 1 Th 3¹², 2 Th 1³) of the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, it must ever be said—*ὑπερπλεόνασε!*

ARCHD. HENDERSON.

Crieff.

Hindu and Christian Light.

MUTTRA, a famous ancient Hindu city full of temples and priests, stands on the Jumna; and along the edge of the river, as far as the city extends, there is a series of fine ghats.¹ On my recent visit my host and I went down after sunset and from a boat in the river saw a very striking sight. On the top of the ghat where Krishna is said to have rested after killing Kamsa there stands a marble table under a graceful arch. Just as it was getting dark, a number of bells hanging from the arch began to ring in jangling tone and time; worshippers began to gather round; and a handsome young priest brought a large lamp, containing forty or fifty tiny lamps arranged in a pyramid, and set it upon the table. When all these lights were lighted, the priest took the great lamp in his hands, and, standing on the top of the table with his face turned towards the Jumna, waved it in front of him, in adoration of the goddess of the river. He then lifted it high above his head, and held it there steadily with both hands for perhaps half a minute, reminding one of the elevation of the host. He

¹ A ghat is a flight of stone steps leading down to a river or tank for the convenience of bathers.

repeated this waving and uplifting several times, while round about him stood the crowd of worshippers, pelting him and the lamp with yellow chrysanthemums. At last he got down from the table and set the lamp on it again. At once the worshippers crowded round and tried to catch the flames in their hands, or to take a little of the hot oil in their fingers and daub it on their foreheads.

Before the ceremony began, we noted that the water between our boat and the ghat was packed close with turtles, crowding towards the steps. As soon as the ritual of the lamp was completed, numbers of the worshippers came down the steps and threw into the river handfuls of grain which the turtles eagerly devoured. Monkeys also came running down the steps, eager to get a mouthful; and so close was the array of turtles that some half a dozen monkeys left the steps and stood on their backs, picking up every particle of grain they could get.

A few of the worshippers also brought with them tiny lamps like doll's saucers, each with its few drops of oil and miniature wick. These they lighted and set on little rafts of reed, and then sent them afloat on the river in honour of the goddess.

The waving of lights before an image in the evening is one of the regular parts of the worship of every Hindu temple. The name is *āratī*. The ritual at Muttra is simply a slight modification of it. I understand a similar ceremony is observed every evening on one of the ghats of Pushkara in honour of the lake, and also on the Manikarnika Ghat, Benares, in adoration of the Ganges.

The scene at Muttra was extremely interesting and picturesque, and also deeply impressive. Yet how much more impressive and far-shining is the Christian's light!

J. N. FARQUHAR.

Matthew xi. 19.

'WISDOM is justified of her children.' So the Greek MSS. C D L, the second hand of B, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Curetonian Syriac, Alford, and Lk 7²⁵ ('all her children'). On the other hand, **א** and B, the Memphitic version, the Peshito, the Persian in Walton, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the R.V. have 'of her works.'

How did the variant reading arise? Lagarde suggested that *τέκνα* and *ἐργα* both go back to a common Aramaic **עֲבָדִיא**. Dr. A. H. M'Neile, in

his *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, properly objects that in the sense of 'slaves' would not be represented by *τέκνα*. 'Παῖδες' or *δοῦλοι* would be the more natural rendering; *παῖδες*, however, might be altered to *τέκνα* in the course of tradition. Cf. 4 Es 7¹⁴ (Lat. "operibus," Eth. "sons," Syr. "servants").' In point of fact **עֲבָד** never is rendered by *τέκνα* in the LXX.

The source of the variant reading must, therefore, be sought elsewhere, and, in fact, it has apparently arisen from a confusion between the two Hebrew words **עֲוָלָה** and **מַעַלָּה** or **עֲלִילָה** (or their Aramaic equivalents). The former word, *‘olāl* or *‘olēl* (which the A.V. renders 'children,' 'young children,' 'infants' or 'babes,' Ps 8³ 17¹⁴, etc.), appears to be frequently misread in the versions, being rather a rare word. The Targum and Syriac frequently and the Vulgate in 2 K 8¹² ('juvenis') appear to have mistaken it for **עַלְמָה** ('a youth'); and in Mic 2⁹, 'From their children have ye taken away my glory for ever,' the LXX renders *διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδένματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν*. 'Ἐπιτηδένμα' regularly answers to **לְלָעָה** (sometimes **עֲלִילָה**) in the Hebrew text. This is evidently the same error as we have in MSS. of the Gospel. 'Of her children' is in Hebrew **תְּלִילָה**, and 'of her works' **תְּלִילָה**, so that the one could easily be mistaken for the other. The LXX render **לְלָעָה** by *τέκνον* in Is 13¹⁶. The reading of the R.V. will, therefore, be wrong, and that of the A.V. right.

T. H. WEIR.

University of Glasgow.

The Baptism of John (St. Matt. iii. 5, 6).

'THEN went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.'

Thus, quietly and naturally, does the Evangelist tell of John's Baptism. But whence did the idea come? Why should the people have been baptized? Why should they have wanted to be baptized? What did they know about Baptism? What is the origin of Baptism?

It is natural to say that John's Baptism was anticipatory of Christ's, but whence did John's Baptism arise? We are directed to the Baptism of Proselytes among the Jews, but there seems to

be no record or proof of Proselyte Baptism before the end of the first century of the Christian era. Dr. Plummer (Hastings' *D.B.*) says that it is not credible that it did not exist previously—but the fact remains that there is no record of it. Dr. Brandt (*Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*) lays little emphasis on the Jewish rite; and Dr. Bartlett goes so far as to say: 'In fact, we need begin our study no further back than the point at which the term (Baptism) first emerges in the Bible, —the Baptism of John the Baptist and what it assumes.' With this I cannot agree. We seem to have plenty of evidence as to Ethnic Baptism of various kinds among many primitive races, but none in regard to the Jews. Yet it was amongst the Jews that Baptism, as we understand it, suddenly arose.

We must ask—why should the Jewish people have gone out in crowds to be baptized in the river Jordan, confessing their sins? No Evangelist apparently thought it strange. Yet, so far as we know, it was an absolutely new thing. Surely, there must have been something which made the people consider that it was a natural thing to do.

For myself, I am inclined to think that Baptism must somehow have been connected with the apocalyptic expectations of the Jews; that somehow it was to be a feature of the Messiah's Kingdom. Else how shall we explain Jn 1²⁵: 'And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou art not the Christ, neither Elijah, neither the Prophet?' This passage clearly connects Baptism with the coming of the Messiah.

Some things have become so usual that we forget to ask whence they came.

L. A. POOLER.

Downpatrick.

More Sayings attributed to Christ.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (1893-4, pp. 59, 107, 177, 178, 503, 504, 561), Professor D. S. Margoliouth drew the attention of his readers to some Sayings of Jesus found in Muhammadan literature, mostly in Ghazali's *Revival of the Religious Sciences*.

Before one is able to form a judgment as to the origin and provenance of these Sayings, their literature ought to be better known. To say that they have simply been invented by the writers

who quoted them is an hypothesis which does not seem to be very attractive. It is not necessary to dwell here on the fact that even in the first centuries of Islam some writers indulged in frequent attributions of ethical maxims to Christ and to prophets of antiquity.

We give below the translation of three 'Agrapha.' They are found in a rather rare work of the famous Spanish mystic Muhyid-Din ibnul-'Arabi (died 1240 A.D.). The title of the work is *Book of the Beautiful Admonition*. The gist of its narrative is derived from aphorisms ascribed to Jewish, Christian, and Muhammadan prophets and holy men.

The manuscript is preserved in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, and is numbered Cod. Arab. 399. It contains a list of 28 Arabic treatises by ibnul-'Arabi, the work under consideration being the twenty-third of the series.

Fol. 209^b. Jesus said: 'Leave the world and meditate over death. To a believer death comes with good which has no evil after it, but to a wicked man it comes with an evil which has no good after it' (cf. Mt 23¹³).

Fol. 213^a. (In one of His sermons to the children of Israel.) Jesus said: 'O Doctors and Teachers of the Law! You have sat down in the way to the world to come; you do not walk in it yourselves in order to reach heaven, and you do not permit others to walk in it and to reach heaven. But the ignorant is more excusable than the learned.'

Fol. 215^a. (Speaking to God of His enemies.) Jesus said: 'If Thou punishmentest them, they are Thy servants; but if Thou forgivest them, Thou art the Mighty, the Wise' (Koran, 5, 118).

A. MINGANA.

Manchester.

1 Cor. xv. 5-8.

Vv. 5-8 of 1 Co 15 are very important in connexion with the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus. Paul here mentions five such appearances—(1) to Cephas, (2) to the Twelve, (3) 'to above five hundred brethren at once,' (4) to James, (5) to himself. Now the significant point is that he speaks of Jesus' appearance to himself in the same breath, and in exactly the same way as to those others. We are in the habit of distinguishing in every respect the way in which Jesus

appeared to Paul from the manner of His appearing to the disciples as recorded in the Gospels. But Paul is not aware of any distinction at all. 'He appeared to Cephas . . . to the Twelve . . . to James . . . and to me.' That is a perfectly fair summary in his own words of what Paul said, and one can scarcely doubt that he missed the significance of the very plain words he used. Jesus then appeared to him in the same way as He did to the disciples; and *vice versa* (and it is this *vice versa* that is so significant), *Jesus appeared to the disciples in the same way as He appeared to him*. Now we are not accustomed (because obviously Paul was not accustomed) to associate anything corporeal with the appearance of Jesus which Paul saw (remember He 'appeared' to him, which can only mean that Paul saw Him). It is therefore clear that he equally did not associate anything corporeal with the other appearances of Jesus which he mentions.

Is not this weighty evidence in connexion with the nature of the Resurrection Body of our Lord, so weighty that it is extraordinary that it has been so neglected in discussions on that most important subject?

R. E. LEE.

Karachi.

Genesis xviii. 20, 21.

'AND the LORD said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know.'

Throughout the narrative in chap. 18 there is no reference to Gomorrah except in v.²⁰, and everything leads us to suppose that Sodom alone was mentioned in the original text. The construction as it stands in the M.T. is very difficult.

As Professor Skinner remarks in his *Genesis*, the point to be investigated is whether the 'cry' that has come up is a true report of the 'sin' of the city; and the text, as it stands, does not bring this out clearly.

We suggest that we should read:

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה זֶקְעַת סָדֶם אָמְרָה כִּי רַבָּה חַטָּאתֶם כִּי כְבָדָה מַאֲדָד: אֲרֹהָה נָא וְאֶרְאָה הַכְּעַקְתָּה הַבָּאָה אֵלֶּי עֲשָׂו כְּלָה: אַמְּדָלָא אַדְּעָה: (בְּכָה) וְאַמְּדָלָא אַדְּעָה: (or better)

'And Jahwe said, The cry of Sodom (the city personified) says that (or truly) great is their (the inhabitants') sin, that (or truly) it is very grievous. I will go down now that I may see whether accord-

ing to its cry they have (altogether) done; for if not, I would know.'

For the use of כִּי after אמר see Gn 29²².

Professor Skinner's translation of v.²¹, 'We will go down that we may see whether . . . or not: we would see,' hardly takes sufficient account of the *vav* in the phrase אַמְּדָלָא אַדְּעָה.

The question whether we should restore the *plu.* throughout has not been considered in the above emendation.

W. R. W. GARDNER.

Zeitoun, Egypt.

The Wind of God.

DR. PETERS' treatment of Gn 1²⁶ is interesting if not convincing. He has still the following considerations to face:—

1. There is an imposing array of authorities against him, viz. LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, Basil, Jerome, A.V., R.V., Gesenius, Fürst, Ox. Heb. Lex., Brockelmann's Syr. Lex., Syr. Thesaurus (Smith), Swete, Kautzsch (*H.D.B.*), and Dillmann.

2. The word in question has the same form and meaning in both Hebrew and Syriac, and the Syriac Bible has the following, the meanings being taken from the R.V.:

Gn 1². 'Moved,' 'brooded' (margin).

Ex 34⁶. 'Gracious.'

Ps 86¹⁵. 'Gracious.'

Ps 111⁴. 'Full of compassion.'

N.T. Ph 2¹. 'Tender mercies.'

Gesenius quotes—

Ephr. ii. p. 552. Birds brooding over their young.

Ephr. ii. p. 419. Parents cherishing their children.

Ephr. i. p. 529. Elisha cherishing the body of dead child.

3. These references have behind them personality or vital action and are not satisfied by a physical action such as the rushing of wind.

4. Might it not be said that Dr. Peters' contention makes wind appear too early in the Drama of Creation? Ought it not to come upon the scene with the appearance of light (heat)?

At the particular point in the drama the Breather (רוּחַ, 'to breathe') of life appears to organize chaos into cosmos for the incarnation of life.

I cannot yet subscribe to 'The wind of God rushed upon the face of the waters.'

I. LOUIS BEDFORD.

Chester.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.